DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 242 306 IR 011 018

AUTHOR Albright, Michael J.
TITLE The Status of Media Centers in Higher Education.
INSTITUTION Association for Educational Communications and Technology, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Dec 83
NOTE 99p.; Prepared by the Task Force on the Status of Media Centers in Higher Education of the Division for Educational Media Management, Association for Educational Communications and Technology.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Budgets; Distance Education; *Educational Media; Employment Patterns; Higher Education; *Learning Resources Centers; *Media Specialists; Program Descriptions; Questionnaires; *Services; Surveys; Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

This report presents an analysis of data provided by 196 usable responses to a survey of a stratified sample of 282 college and university media centers. Information was collected on the following topics: current trends in budget and personnel levels; the degree of moral support provided by supervisors and the faculty clientele; the extent to which media centers participate in such activities as instructional computing and distance learning program development and delivery; the degree to which media centers generate income and promote their services; and media directors' perceptions of the health of their media programs. The report includes an executive summary and an introduction that covers task force composition, development of the survey instrument, sample selection, data collection, and institutions without media centers. Detailed results are then presented for each topic addressed in the survey. Nine recommendations are made and three references listed. Appendices include lists of task force members and responding institutions, a copy of the questionnaire, comments provided in free response items, and case histories. (LMM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED242306

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: HE

In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

The Status of Media Centers in Higher Education

by

The Task Force on the Status of Media Centers in Higher Education

Michael J. Albright, Chair

Sponsored by

The Division for Educational Media Management

Association for Educational Communications and Technology

December 1983

IR011018

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Michael J. Albright

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Executive Summary

Between October 1982 and June 1983, the Task Force on the Status of Media Centers in Higher Education, of AECT's Division for Educational Media Management (DEMM), surveyed 196 members of a stratified sample of college and university media centers.

Information was collected on current trends in budget and personnel levels; the degree of moral support provided by supervisors and the faculty clientele; the extent to which media centers participate in such activities as instructional computing and distance learning program development and delivery; the degree to which media centers generate income and promote their services; and media directors' perceptions of the health of their media programs.

The results may be summarized as follows.

1. Although budget and manning trends do not support such an assessment, 82 percent of the respondents felt that their media operations were either "very healthy" or "somewhat healthy" in 1982-83, including 86 percent of the private institution respondents. Sixty-eight percent felt that their media centers were in a healthier posture in 1982-83 than in 1977-78. Among private schools, 80 percent held this view.

2. Location may be a factor in determining media center health Centers in financially troubled states appear more likely to be in less healthy posture, although the data are quite inconsistent.

3. Moral support of the administration, client demand, quality of staff, good management practices, and history of reliable products and services are the most frequently cited reasons for

media center health. Budgetary conditions dominate the list of reasons for lack of health.

4. While some media centers continue to receive satisfactory budgetary support from their institutions, 43 percent of the respondents at public and 30 percent at private institutions reported no budgetary growth in 1982-83. Among public institutions in the "unhealthy" catagory, just 17 percent were awarded increases that kept up with a 6 percent annual inflation rate.

5. Only 28 percent of all public institution media centers providing this information were able to maintain budgets that kept up with a 60 percent inflation rate between 1977-78 and 1982-83. Fifty-four percent were unable to increase their budgets by as much as 30 percent, and 9 percent had no increase at all over this five-year period. By contrast, 55 percent of the private institution media center budgets were increased by at least 60 percent.

6. Most large media centers generate income, while most small ones do not. Charges for services, rentals, and sales of supplies were the most frequently mentioned revenue-generating activities.

7. Less than 15 percent of the respondents reported receiving grants from off-campus sources in 1982-83. Most were for relatively small amounts and appeared to support software collections.

8. Sixty-five percent of the media centers at public institutions were staffed by five or more people in 1982-83, while 79 percent of the media staffs at private colleges had fewer than five persons. Thirty-five percent of the private media centers had just one full-time employee, and 13 percent had none.

9. One-fourth of all public institution media centers surveyed reported the loss of at least one staff position in 1982-83, while just 4 percent of the private colleges lost media positions.

10. Between 1977-78 and 1982-83, 40 percent of the public institutions surveyed lost more media positions than they gained, while only 8 percent of the private colleges lost media positions. The 108 public institutions responding to this item collectively suffered a net loss of 47 positions during this five-year period, while the 84 private colleges added 32 positions.

11. Administrative and technical positions were most frequently deleted, while production positions, particularly in video, were most commonly added.

12. The level of moral support provided to media centers by senior administrators and faculty members appears to be high, suggesting personal, if not financial, commitment to media programs.

13. Media centers in higher education are known by a wide variety of functional titles. Fifty-four unique titles were identified among the responding institutions.

14. Just 22 percent of the respondents reported any activity in the area of instructional computing, and most of these services appear to be minimal. Very little activity was reported by liberal arts and community colleges.

15. Media center involvement in institutional distance learning efforts appears to be minimal, although some respondents reported thriving cable television or ITFS activities.

16. Most media centers actively promote their services. Flyers and brochures, media workshops, and periodic newsletters were cited frequently..

17. Thirty-nine percent of all public comprehensive colleges responding reported some damage from on-campus competition, a problem apparently unique to this group of respondents.

18. Budget-related concerns dominate the list of most serious challenges facing respondents.

The report concludes with recommendations for AECT and DEMN action.

Table of Contents

Introduction....1
Composition of the Task Force....2
Development of the Survey Instrument....2
Selection of the Sample....2
Data Collection....4
Institutions Without Media Centers....6

Results....7
Health of Media Centers....7
Trends in Media Center Health, 1977-82....9
General Health of Media Centers, 1982-83....9
Juxtaposition of Health and Trend....11
Relationship of Health and Location....13
Reasons for Media Center Health Status....13
Funding Patterns....15
1982-83 Budgets....16
Trends in Budget Allocations, 1977-78 to 1982-83....20
Self-Generated Income....22
Who Generates Revenue?....22
Amount of Generated Income....23
Revenue-Producing Activities....24
Disposition of Generated Revenues....25
Grants....25
Patterns in Personnel Levels....26
Full-Time Employees, 1982-83....27
Changes in Full-Time Employees, 1981-82 to 1982-83....28
Changes in Full-Time Employees, 1977-78 to 1982-83....29
Titles of Full-Time Positions Added and Deleted....31
Number of Student Employees....32
Patterns in Moral Support....35
Nature of Moral Support....35
Trend in Moral Support....39
Contrast Between Librarian/Non-Librarian Supervisor....43
Names of Media Centers....44
Computing Services Provided....46
Support of Distance Learning....46
Promotion of Media Services....49
Campus Competition....51
Most Serious Challenges....51
Case Histories....53
Questions Not Analyzed....53

Recommendations of the Task Force....53

Appendices....57
A - Members of the Task Force....57
B - Copy of the Questionnaire....58
C - Responding Institutions....63
D - Comments Provided in "Free Response" Items....68
E - Case Histories....86

The Task Force on the Status of Media Centers in Higher Education was established by the Board of Directors of the Division for Educational Media Management (DEMM) during the 1982 AECT national convention at Dallas. Its primary responsibility was to develop a profile of the conditions existing in higher education media centers.

The Task Force was formed for the purpose of documenting such factors as:

(1) current trends in budget and personnel levels;

(2) the degree of moral support provided by supervisors and the faculty clientele;

(3) the extent to which media centers participate in those activities that might strengthen their status on campus, such as providing instructional computing services or contributing to the institution's distance learning effort;

(4) the degree to which media centers support their operations by generating income and promoting their services; and

(5) media directors' own perceptions of the overall health of their centers, particularly from the perspective of whether this health has improved or deteriorated over the past five years.

It was the hope of the Task Force that these factors could be tabulated in such a way that characteristics common to strong and weak media programs could be identified. This information could then be translated into AECT and DEMM programming designed to

strengthen all media centers in postsecondary education.

Composition of the Task Force. The Task Force was organized shortly after the 1982 AECT national convention. Ultimately, 23 DEMM members contributed to the project. The Task Force participants are listed in Appendix A.

Development of the Survey Instrument. The original set of questions for the survey form was developed by four Task Force members in mid-summer 1982. The prototype questionnaire was then sent to all Task Force members for completion and evaluation. Based on their observations and recommendations, the questionnaire was revised, and a second draft was sent to the entire Task Force for review. The survey form was revised again as the result of this evaluation round, and the final version was completed in October 1982. The questionnaire is attached as Appendix B.

The original draft questionnaire was six pages in length. The consensus of the Task Force was that this length would deter many in the sample from providing thoughtful responses. The form was then edited to five pages, but further reductions would have reduced the scope of the survey. As it was, the length limitation prohibited the collection of in-depth information on any specific subject. Researchers interested in more extensive study of a narrower topic will find responses to these general questions of value when developing their own survey instruments.

Selection of the Sample. Institutions in the sample were categorized by the classification system developed by the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies (1976). This system classifies virtually every college and university in the United States into

one of five stratifications:

(1) Research universities (RES) are those that award at least 50 doctorates per year and are among the 100 leading institutions in receipt of Federal funding for research;

(2) Doctorate-granting universities (DOC) are those remaining schools that award at least 10 doctorates per year, from at least three different disciplines;

(3) Comprehensive colleges and universities (COMP) offer both liberal arts and professional or occupational degree programs, but few, if any, are at the doctoral level;

(4) Liberal arts colleges (LIB) are those traditional four-year liberal arts institutions; and

(5) Community and junior colleges (CJC) include all two-year institutions.

The Carnegie Council actually broke down each classification into two sub-categories, such as Research University I and II, but the Task Force did not feel the need for such a differentiation. It did, however, follow the Council's example in dividing each classification into public and private sub-categories.

Unfortunately, distribution of the Council's classification system was limited, and a copy was not immediately available to the Task Force. Therefore, an existing sample, one drawn on a random basis by the Carnegie Commission for a study of college catalogs in 1976, was adopted. While the decision to "borrow" a sample was made with reservations, it was determined that the Commission's study had no relevance whatsoever to this one, that the Commission had not actually solicited data from the

institutions in the sample, and that the chances that any individual would be involved in both studies would be practically nil.

It was also decided that the survey would be mailed only to centralized media centers serving entire campuses. The Task Force did not want to confound its data by mixing responses of both centralized and departmental or specialized media operations.

Data Collection. The survey form was mailed to 282 institutions in October 1982. Approximately 40 percent responded. A second mailing in December 1982 brought the total number of responses to 161, a 57 percent return rate. Since it was felt that non-response could be due to factors of interest, a sub-group of the Task Force attempted to contact each of the remaining institutions by telephone. Responses were obtained from an additional 64 media centers as the result of the telephone survey, bringing the total number of respondents to 225, an 80 percent return rate.

Of these, three were unable to complete the questionnaire because of internal reorganizations. Twenty-six institutions (12 percent) reported that their campuses do not maintain centralized media centers. (See below.) Therefore, the number of usable responses was 196. These institutions are listed in Appendix C. Table 1 contains a breakdown of the respondents by classification and funding source.

The total "N" upon which this report is based includes 31 research, 31 doctorate-granting, 55 comprehensive, 37 liberal

Table 1

Usable Responses, by Classification

Class	PUB	PRI	T
RES	19	12	31
DOC	19	12	31
COMP	39	16	55
LIB	4	33	37
CJC	29	13	42
T	110	86	196

arts, and 42 community/junior colleges, with 110 public and 86 private institutions.

The Task Force encountered major difficulty in obtaining names and addresses for the media centers in the sample. Institution addresses are available from any number of sources. However, most references on survey research suggest that the highest rate of return is obtained when the questionnaire is mailed to a specific individual. Not only were names of persons not readily available to the Task Force, but the problem was compounded by the fact that media centers themselves are known by a wide variety of functional titles. Unless the name of the media director was known to a Task Force member, the questionnaire was addressed to "Director, University (or College) Audiovisual Center," on the assumption that "audiovisual center" might be the most recognizable term for campus mail offices.

Nonetheless, those conducting the telephone survey reported that a number of questionnaires never were delivered. It was felt that a comprehensive directory, listing all college media centers in the United States and including names, addresses, and telephone

numbers of key personnel, would be a tremendously useful document in conducting future research.

Institutions Without Media Centers. One of the factors precipitating this survey was the knowledge that several postsecondary institutions had closed their centralized media centers in the recent past. While none of these institutions appeared in the sample, the survey did identify 26 colleges and universities that do not currently maintain centralized media centers, nearly 12 percent of the respondents. Some extremely prestigious institutions are among them, including two from the Southwest Conference and two from the Big Ten. Since it is likely that non-response in some cases among the 57 unheard-from institutions was due to the absence of a media center, this percentage could possibly be higher for the sample as a whole.

Table 2 indicates the number of institutions without centralized media centers, by classification and funding source. It was somewhat surprising that the highest percentages are found among research and doctorate-granting universities. However, the

Table 2

Institutions Without Centralized Media Centers

Class	PUB	PRI	TOT
RES	2 (10)[a]	6 (33)	8 (21)
DOC	3 (14)	3 (20)	6 (16)
COMP	3 (07)	2 (11)	5 (08)
LIB	1 (20)	3 (08)	4 (10)
CJC	2 (06)	1 (07)	3 (07)
T	11 (09)	15 (15)	26 (12)

[a] Numbers in parentheses indicate percent of total number responding.

size and political influence of colleges and departments maintaining their own media services within large universities are likely to have served as barriers to the centralization of these services. This may be particularly true at private research universities, where the incidence of decentralized media programs appears to be about 33 percent. Overall, decentralized media services are slightly more prevalent among private institutions.

The mail survey did not request information regarding absence of centralized media services. However, this question was added to the telephone questionnaire. Of the six institutions reporting no centralized media centers during the phone survey, none had ever established such centers. The media center at one public comprehensive university responding to the mail survey reported that it was currently being disestablished, and several others indicated that they did not expect their centers to exist in five years. One research university indicating that its media center was in "deep trouble" has maintained one of this nation's most highly respected graduate programs in educational technology.

Results

Health of Media Centers

The Task Force was interested in media directors' perception of the health of their centers, first from the point of view of current status, and second from the perspective of a trend from 1977 to 1982. The outcome was much more positive than the Task Force expected. However, the trends in funding and manning levels, to be reported below, do not generally support the notion of an improving situation.

Several factors could account for the mostly favorable response to this set of questions. Since the period 1977-82 was one of budget crises and general retrenchment throughout higher education, respondents could be indicating that media programs have fared as well as or better than other units at their institutions, and this could be a positive sign. Cutbacks at several media centers have resulted in internal reorganizations, and in some cases mergers with other campus agencies, that have

Table 3

Trend in Media Center Health, 1977-82

Class	N	CI[a]	SI	S	SD	CD	$\bar{X}$[b]
			Public				
RES	19	8	5	3	2	1	2.11
DOC	19	4	6	3	4	2	2.68
COMP	39	8	12	10	5	4	2.62
LIB	4	3	0	0	0	1	2.00
CJC	29	5	13	3	5	3	2.59
TOT	110	28	36	19	16	11	2.51
(%)		(25)	(33)	(17)	(15)	(10)	
			Private				
RES	12	4	5	0	2	1	2.25
DOC	12	6	3	2	1	0	1.83
COMP	16	7	8	0	1	0	1.69
LIB	33	15	11	3	4	0	1.88
CJC	13	5	5	1	2	0	2.00
TOT	86	37	32	6	10	1	1.91
(%)		(43)	(37)	(07)	(12)	(01)	

[a]
CI - Considerably Improved (1)
SI - Somewhat Improved (2)
S - About the Same (3)
SD - Somewhat Deteriorated (4)
CD - Considerably Deteriorated (5)

[b]
Note: Mean computed from point values indicated in (a) above.

strengthened the centers positions on campus and have placed greater emphasis on quality rather than quantity. Another possibility is that some respondents simply were unwilling to admit that the situation had deteriorated under their leadership.

Trend in Media Center Health, 1977-82. Table 3 summarizes media directors' perceptions of the current status of their centers compared with that of five years earlier. A positive picture prevails across all five classifications, public and private. Sixty-eight percent of the respondents felt that their centers were better off in 1982-83 than in 1977-78. Among private institutions, 80 percent held this view. Overall, only 19 percent felt that their situations had deteriorated, including just 13 percent of the private school respondents.

General Health of Media Centers, 1982-83. Since trends are most valuable when a referent is established, respondents were asked to assess the current health (as of the 1982-83 school year) of their media centers. These data are summarized in Table 4. Overall, 82 percent placed their centers in "healthy" categories, while just 18 percent felt their centers were "unhealthy". Among private institutions, 86 percent were regarded as "healthy", including 31 percent "very healthy". Only nine media centers, or just five percent, were considered to be "in deep trouble" by their directors.

When funding reductions and personnel cutbacks (described below) are considered, these are amazing statistics, far more positive than might have been expected. Not only is the percentage of "healthy" media centers, as perceived by their directors, remarkably high, but the trend figures above suggest

Table 4

Current General Health of Media Center

Class	N	VH[a]	SH	ST	DT	$\bar{X}$[b]
			Public			
RES	19	8	8	3	0	1.74
DOC	19	4	11	3	1	2.05
COMP	39	9	20	6	4	2.13
LIB	4	2	1	1	0	1.75
CJC	29	7	17	4	1	1.97
TOT	110	30	57	17	6	1.99
(%)		(27)	(52)	(15)	(06)	
			Private			
RES	12	4	6	1	1	1.92
DOC	12	3	7	2	0	1.92
COMP	16	6	9	1	0	1.69
LIB	33	10	17	5	1	1.91
CJC	13	4	8	0	1	1.85
TOT	86	27	47	9	3	1.86
(%)		(31)	(55)	(10)	(04)	

[a] VH - Very Healthy (1)
SH - Somewhat Healthy (2)
ST - Some Trouble (3)
DT - Deep Trouble (4)

[b] Note: Mean calculated from point values indicated in (a) above.

that situations are improving at a substantial number of institutions.

Readers must consider that the data described in this report represent the picture at a particular point in time -- the middle of the 1982-83 academic year. Members of the Task Force continue to hear horror stories of major cutbacks, layoffs, and mandated reorganizations in college and university media centers, including some members of the sample. Had the survey been conducted in 1983-84, a somewhat different profile could have been expected.

Table 5

Current Health by Trend

	VH	SH	ST	DT	T
CI	38 (19)	27 (14)	0 (00)	0 (00)	65
SI	16 (08)	46 (23)	5 (03)	1 (00)	68
S	2 (01)	20 (10)	3 (02)	0 (00)	25
SD	1 (00)	10 (05)	11 (06)	4 (02)	26
CD	0 (00)	1 (00)	7 (04)	4 (02)	12
T	57	104	26	9	196

Replication of this study at regular intervals, with the resulting comparisons, could well be a more accurate indicator of these trends.

Juxtaposition of Health and Trend. When Tables 3 and 4 are combined, the result provides an even more dramatic illustration of the positive posture in which many media directors perceive their operations. (See Table 5.) Nineteen percent of the respondents identified their media centers as both "very healthy" and "considerably improved", the second highest cell percentage, while just 2 percent were placed in the opposite corner, "in deep trouble" and "considerably deteriorated".

The dotted line in Table 5 separates those media centers perceived to be in an improving posture from those in a declining posture. This line separates the "healthy" from the "unhealthy", as they will be referred to in this report. A total of 154 of the

Table 6

Health of Public Institution
Media Centers, by State

	VH	SH	ST	DT
CI	VA (17)	FL (11)		
	IA (22)	OR (50)		
	OH (25)	OH (25)		
	UT (16)	IL (46)		
	OK (02)	VT (13)		
	OH (25)	IA (22)		
	ND (03)	GA (14)		
	LA (12)	VA (17)		
	NY (15)	SC (39)		
	MN (38)	NY (15)		
SI	CA (47)	AL (43)	WA (42)	KS (21)
	IA (22)	OR (50)	LA (12)	MS (34)
	NE (32)	ME (29)	ND (03)	MI (31)
	DE (18)	ND (03)	NE (32)	
	OH (25)	TX (05)	PA (35)	
	KS (21)	IL (46)	CA (47)	
	CA (47)	OR (50)	KS (21)	
	LA (12)	LA (12)	MN (38)	
	CA (47)	NJ (30)	MN (38)	
	OR (50)	NY (15)	AZ (28)	
	MD (24)	GA (14)	MN (38)	
		IA (22)		
S	MA (10)	IN (45)	NC (20)	FL (11)
		IN (45)	NC (20)	
		GA (14)	NM (09)	
		WI (40)	CA (47)	
		OH (25)	NY (15)	
		OH (25)	KS (21)	
		VA (17)	FL (11)	
		WI (40)	GA (14)	
SD		AL (43)	HI (07)	TN (36)
		WI (40)	PA (35)	VA (17)
		PA (35)	FL (11)	
		SC (39)	WA (42)	
		MA (10)	MO (48)	
		WA (42)	KS (21)	
		CA (47)	WA (42)	
CD		CT (19)	WA (42)	MI (31)
			TX (05)	ID (37)
			ID (37)	NE (32)
			NC (20)	CA (47)
			NC (20)	
			CA (47)	

196 respondents, or 79 percent, placed themselves in the "healthy" category, including 84 percent of the private institutions reporting.

Relationship of Health and Location. M. M. Chambers, an Illinois State University education professor, compiles an annual report comparing state appropriations to higher education (see Magarrell, 1982). One of Chambers' Tables rank orders states according to percent increase or decrease over two-year periods. Table 6, which follows the format of Table 5 and includes only public institutions, identifies the location of the media centers in each cell by state. The number in parentheses is the rank order of that state, according to Chambers' data for 1982-83.

An analysis of the rank orders appears to confirm that a relationship may exist between location and media center health. Of the 82 public institutions in the "healthy" category, 49, or 60 percent, are located in states in the top half of Chambers' rank order. Eighteen of the 28 public institutions (64 percent) in the "unhealthy" category are located in states in the bottom half of the rank order. It must be observed, however, that the data are inconsistent. Some media centers in financially troubled states appear to be quite healthy, while others in relatively strong states seem to be in some trouble.

Reasons for Media Center Health Status. Respondents were asked to list reasons why their media centers were healthy or unhealthy. Tables 7 and 8 summarize these responses, respectively. Moral support of the administration was the most frequently mentioned reason for positive health, followed by client demand, attitude and/or ability of staff, good management,

Table 7

Reasons for Media Center Health

Reason	N
Moral support of administration	53
Demand for product/Support of clientele	43
Attitude/Ability of staff	36
Good management/leadership	24
Record of success/service	24
Quantity/Quality of equipment	13
Increasing awareness of media	13
Financial support of administration	11
Ability to generate revenue	8
Quality of facility	7
Administrative structure	7
New management in media center	7
Hard work	5
Public relations effort	5
Financial stability of state/institution	4
Cost-saving efforts	3
Do not charge for services	2
Good communication with administration	2
Endowment/Grant money	2
Faculty rank of director	1
Good rapport with clientele	1
Cable TV operation	1
Availability of microcomputers	1
Self-service feature of media center	1

Table 8

Reasons for Lack of Media Center Health

Reason	N
Insufficient budget/Budget cuts	34
General economic conditions	11
Staff reductions/Lack of personnel	9
Lack of institutional support	9
Lack of good equipment	6
Inadequate facilities	3
Lack of software	3
Lack of computer capability	2
Administrative organization	2
Campus politics	2
Increased dependence on generated income	2
Bad faculty attitude	2
Lack of clearly defined institutional mission	1

and history of reliable products and services. These factors are rather significant, because they can be enhanced by the director through sound management practices. They are also quite interdependent.

Budgetary conditions dominate the list of reasons for lack of media center health. An interesting follow-up study would compare the factors listed in Tables 7 and 8 to determine the degree of correlation with perceived media center health. The results might further focus the needs for future AECT and DEMM programming.

Funding Patterns

The apparent optimism of media directors regarding the health of their centers is not generally supported by an analysis of their budgets. While some do appear to be enjoying relatively high levels of financial support, others are enduring rather severe cutbacks. The overall funding picture is rather distressing.

A qualifier is necessary before budgeting data is presented. Although the questionnaire specifically requested that respondents identify the size of the <u>total</u> media center budget, including salaries, many were unable or unwilling to provide this information. Others simply failed to follow directions. Some included salaries, for example, while others did not. Some included the library budget for print-related services. A surprising number of media directors, particularly those housed in libraries, reported that they did not have access to details of their media budgets.

Therefore, the absolute accuracy of the budgetary data that follows may be open to question. However, if it may be assumed

Table 9

1982-83 Budgets, by Classification

Class	N[a]	Median	Range
		Public	
RES	18	$480,000	$121,000 to $2,750,000
DOC	17	236,000	70,000 to 1,200,000
COMP	30	121,000	10,000 to 750,000
LIB	2	134,000	68,000 to 200,000
CJC	22	108,000	17,000 to 825,000
		Private	
RES	11	145,000	5,000 to 791,000
DOC	9	194,000	89,000 to 900,000
COMP	8	51,000	22,000 to 203,000
LIB	23	30,000	1,000 to 350,000
CJC	5	47,000	3,000 to 106,000

[a] Number providing this information.

that respondents reported the same funding base for each year that this information was provided, then the figures quoted below are likely to be quite accurate as representative of trends, and, as such, provide an interesting profile.

1982-82 Budgets. Table 9 lists descriptive data for the 145 institutions providing 1982-83 budget information. As may be expected, the largest universities had the largest media budgets, ranging up to $2.7 million. Private institutions, with lower enrollments and lower institutional budgets in many cases, reported lower overall media budgets.

The differences between 1981-82 and 1982-83 budgets are compiled in Table 10. Among public institutions, 57 percent received increases, while 26 percent received decreases and 17 percent received the same budget amount each year. Thus, 43 percent of the media centers at public colleges and universities

Table 10

Bucget Change, 1981-82 to 1982-83

	Percent Change	RES	DOC	COMP	LIB	CJC	TOT (%)
				Public			
	100 +	0	0	1	0	0	1 (01)
	50-99	0	0	0	0	0	0 (00)
	20-49	1	0	1	0	3	5 (05)
(+)	10-19	1	2	5	1	4	13 (14)
	5-9	4	6	6	1	6	23 (25)
	1-4	3	2	4	1	1	11 (12)
	0	4	3	3	0	6	16 (17)
	1-4	1	1	0	0	2	4 (04)
	5-9	2	0	3	0	2	7 (08)
(-)	10-19	2	3	3	0	1	9 (10)
	20-49	0	0	2	0	1	3 (03)
	50-99	0	0	1	0	0	1 (01)
				Private			
	100 +	0	0	0	1	0	1 (02)
	50-99	0	0	0	1	0	1 (02)
	20-49	3	1	1	2	1	8 (12)
(+)	10-19	5	4	2	6	2	19 (30)
	5-9	0	3	3	5	2	13 (20)
	1-4	0	1	0	2	0	3 (04)
	0	0	0	2	5	1	8 (12)
	1-4	0	0	0	0	0	0 (00)
	5-9	1	0	1	1	0	3 (04)
(-)	10-19	0	0	1	4	0	5 (08)
	20-49	1	0	0	1	1	3 (04)
	50-99	0	0	0	0	1	1 (02)

had no budgetary growth for 1982-83.

The picture was somewhat brighter among private institutions, where 70 percent received increases and only 18 percent suffered decreases. Thirty percent of private college media centers thus lacked budgetary growth during this period. Perhaps more indicative of the disparity between public and private institutions is the size of the increase. Among private schools, 46 percent received budget increases of 10 percent or more, while only 20 percent of the public institution media centers received increases

Table 11

Summary of Budget Changes, 1981-82 to 1982-83[a]

	Public			Private		
	Increase	Same	Decrease	Increase	Same	Decrease
			Healthy			
RES	8	4	4	5	0	2
DOC	8	1	2	7	0	0
COMP	16	0	6	5	2	2
LIB	3	0	0	14	3	6
CJC	10	5	3	5	1	2
TOT	45	10	15	36	6	12
(%)	(64)	(14)	(22)	(67)	(11)	(22)
			Unhealthy			
RES	1	0	1	3	0	0
DOC	2	2	2	2	0	0
COMP	1	3	3	1	0	0
LIB	0	0	0	3	2	0
CJC	4	1	3	0	0	0
TOT	8	6	9	9	2	0
(%)	(35)	(26)	(39)	(82)	(18)	(00)

[a] Note: These figures are not adjusted for inflation.

of that magnitude.

These figures may be somewhat misleading. One of the liberal arts college media centers received an increase from $1,000 to $2,000, a 100 percent raise but hardly one of great significance. Another budget rose from $792 to $1,000, a rather inconsequential 26 percent increase.

Another interesting comparison is that of "healthy" and "unhealthy" media centers. As Table 11 illustrates, the percentage receiving increases and decreases is very similar for public and private categories among "healthy" colleges. The difference between "unhealthy" institutions, however, is rather dramatic and accounts for most of the variations in Table 10 data. Among

"unhealthy" public institutions, only 35 percent of the media centers received budget increases in 1982-83, while 82 percent of the "unhealthy" private college media centers received increases and none received budget cuts. This information raises logical questions as to why the latter were considered "unhealthy". If budgets at these private institutions were inadequate in 1981-82, the increases awarded in 1982-83 may not have been sufficient. It is more likely that the "unhealthy" condition was perceived because of factors unrelated to the budget.

Table 12

Change in Media Center Budget,
1981-82 to 1982-83,
Adjusted for 6 Percent Inflation

	Public			Private		
	N[a]	Increase	Same or Decrease	N	Increase	Same or Decrease
			Healthy			
		[b]				
RES	16	4 (25)	12 (75)	7	5 (71)	2 (29)
DOC	11	8 (73)	3 (27)	7	7 (100)	0 (00)
COMP	22	11 (50)	11 (50)	9	4 (44)	5 (56)
LIB	3	1 (33)	2 (67)	23	12 (52)	11 (48)
CJC	18	8 (44)	10 (56)	8	4 (50)	4 (50)
TOT	70	32 (46)	38 (54)	54	32 (59)	22 (41)
			Unhealthy			
RES	2	1 (50)	1 (50)	3	3 (100)	0 (00)
DOC	6	0 (00)	6 (100)	2	1 (50)	1 (50)
COMP	7	0 (00)	7 (100)	1	1 (100)	0 (00)
LIB	0	0 (00)	0 (00)	5	2 (40)	3 (60)
CJC	8	3 (37)	5 (63)	0	0 (00)	0 (00)
TOT	23	4 (17)	19 (83)	11	7 (64)	4 (36)

[a] Note: N = number providing budget information.

[b] Note: Number in parentheses is percent of N.

According to the Consumer Price Index, the inflation rate from 1981 to 1982 was six percent. Table 12 illustrates the effect of adjusting 1982-83 budgets for inflation. Once again, major discrepancies were observed, both between private and public institutions and "healthy" and "unhealthy" categories. For example, among "unhealthy" institutions, only 17 percent of the media centers at public colleges received increases that kept up with inflation. Sixty-four percent of their private counterparts received budget increases of at least six percent. Likewise, the difference between "healthy" and "unhealthy" public institutions is rather dramatic, while the same comparison among private schools shows minimal differences, and those that exist seem to favor the "unhealthy" institutions.

Trends in Budget Allocations, 1977-78 to 1982-83. According to the Consumer Price Index, inflation increased prices by 60 percent between 1977 and 1982. An insufficient number of "unhealthy" institutions provided 1977-78 data to make healthy/unhealthy

Table 13

Change in Media Center Budget, 1977-78 to 1982-83, Adjusted for Inflation

	Public			Private		
	a N	Less than + 60%	+60% or more	a N	Less than + 60%	+60% or more
RES	11	7	4	5	1	4
DOC	10	9	1	5	2	3
COMP	14	10	4	6	4	2
LIB	1	1	0	12	5	7
CJC	11	7	4	1	1	0
TOT	47	34	13	29	13	16
(%)		(72)	(28)		(45)	(55)

a Number providing 1977-78 and 1982-83 budget data.

comparisons valid, but Table 13 illustrates how private and public categories fared against inflation. Just 28 percent of public institution media centers were able to maintain budgets that kept up with inflation during this five-year period. By contrast, 55 percent of the media centers at private schools were able to increase budgets by at least this amount. These figures are particularly startling when the technological change during this period is considered.

As Table 14 indicates, 54 percent of the public institution media centers were not even able to increase their budgets by as much as 30 percent between 1977 and 1982, and nine percent had no increase at all.

Table 14

Percent Increase in Budget Allocations, 1977-78 to 1982-83

Percent Increase	RES	DOC	COMP	LIB	CJC	TOT (%)
			Public			
200 +	2	1	1	0	2	6 (13)
100-199	0	0	0	0	0	0 (00)
60-99	2	0	3	0	2	7 (15)
30-59	2	2	2	1	2	9 (19)
1-29	4	7	6	0	4	21 (45)
0 -	1	0	2	0	1	4 (09)
			Private			
200 +	0	0	0	3	0	3 (11)
100-199	1	0	0	2	0	3 (11)
60-99	3	3	2	1	0	9 (33)
30-59	1	1	2	0	1	5 (19)
1-29	0	1	2	3	0	6 (22)
0 -	0	0	0	1	0	1 (04)

Note: Dotted line indicates inflation rate of 60 percent, determined by change in Consumer Price Index, 1977-82.

Self-Generated Income

A fairly substantial number of media centers were able to supplement their institutional budget allocations with self-generated income. Generated revenues relieve pressure on the institution to provide 100 percent of the media center's budget. In most cases, these receipts were funneled into a revolving fund as "discretionary money", to be allocated toward personnel, equipment, or supplies as the director deemed appropriate.

One media director at a private research institution reported that his center was entirely self-supporting. His entire budget was the $71,000 the center generated. He checked the "in some trouble" category.

Who Generates Revenue? There is little differentiation between "healthy" and "unhealthy" institutions on this question. A comparison of public and private schools (see Table 15) shows that the practice of generating income is slightly more prevalent among

Table 15

Number of Media Centers Generating Revenue, 1981-82

	Public		Private		Total	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
RES	19	0	11	1	30 (97)	1 (03)
DOC	16	3	9	3	25 (81)	6 (19)
COMP	24	15	10	6	34 (62)	21 (38)
LIB	3	1	9	24	12 (32)	25 (68)
CJC	8	21	2	11	10 (24)	32 (76)
TOT	70	40	41	45	111	85
(%)	(64)	(36)	(48)	(52)	(57)	(43)

Note: There was little differentiation between "healthy" and "unhealthy" media centers on this question.

public institutions (64 percent to 48 percent, overall). However, the important difference here is in the comparison of classifications.

Nearly all research universities generate income, as do 81 percent of the doctorate-granting institutions. By contrast, only 32 percent of the liberal arts colleges and 24 percent of the two-year institutions generate revenue. The percentage of respondents reporting no activity in this area is quite significant. Media directors at the liberal arts and community college levels appear to be less likely to have control over their budgets, and consequently, might be less able to establish revenue-producing procedures. Some media directors may simply be unaware of opportunities and procedures for generating income. Others are employed by institutions where bookkeeping systems do not permit this kind of flexibility.

Amount of Generated Income. Table 16 provides descriptive

Table 16

Amount of Revenue Generated, by Classification

Class	N	Median	Range
		Public	
RES	16	$200,000	$4,000 to $2,200,000
DOC	15	75,000	6,000 to 400,000
COMP	16	27,000	500 to 347,000
LIB	2	4,000	1,000 to 7,000
CJC	6	1,000	500 to 45,000
		Private	
RES	10	65,000	1,000 to 279,000
DOC	6	30,000	3,000 to 73,000
COMP	8	2,000	400 to 5,000
LIB	7	300	100 to 1,000
CJC	2	1,500	10 to 3,000

information regarding the amount of revenue generated. The amount vary greatly, from $10 at a private junior college to over $2.2 million at the public research institution with the $2.7 million media budget. In general, private institution media centers generate much less income than their public counterparts. These disparities are quite evident in the comparison of median and maximum amounts generated.

Revenue-Producing Activities. Activities by which media centers generate income are listed in Table 17. The first five were provided in the mail questionnaire. The sixth, "charges for services not in support of instruction", was added to the phone

Table 17

Revenue-Generating Activities

	N
Charges for services	81
Sales of supplies	75
Equipment rentals	64
Rentals of films/tapes	44
Sales of films/tapes [a]	35
Charges for services not in support of instruction	20

Note: The following were written in by respondents.

Equipment repair charges	5
Sales/production of souvenirs	2
Contract work	2
Duplicating services	2
Consulting	1
Rental of facilities	1
Fines on overdues	1
Photocopy service	1
Courier service	1
UPS service	1
Lab fees	1
Workshops	1
Microform copies	1
Kodak dealership	1

[a] Note: This item was listed only in the telephone survey.

survey form because several persons made this differentiation on the mail survey. Had this item initially been included in the mail questionnaire, it is likely to have been checked by a greater number of respondents, with a related drop in the tallies for "charges for services". The remaining activities were written in by respondents and provide a provocative list of revenue-producing possibilities.

Disposition of Generated Revenues. Eighty-four percent of the respondents reporting generated revenue were able to incorporate all of it into their media budgets. Eight percent were permitted to retain a portion of it, while just eight percent were required to turn all of it in to the institution. Nearly all the generated revenues reverting to the business office went into the general fund.

Grants

Only 29 of the 196 respondents received grants from off-campus sources during the 1982-83 school year, less than 15 percent. Of these, eight were Title II-A grants awarded to two-year colleges for the purchase of software. No two others came from the same funding agency, and only two were awarded for amounts exceeding $50,000. State agencies and foundations were the most frequently mentioned sources of grant funds. Although patterns are difficult to detect, a common objective appears to be development of film libraries. Funding agencies and amounts, when provided, are listed in Table 18.

Table 18

Sources and Amounts of Grants Received

Class	Source	Amount
RES	Private business	$25,000
RES	Utah Endowment for the Humanities	47,500
RES	Michael Foundation	15,500
RES	A. B. Dick Foundation	----
RES	National Endowment for the Humanities	20,000
RES	Private individual	4,500
RES	World Bank	----
DOC	Vermont Assn. for Mental Health	18,000
DOC	Vermont Council on Humanities and Public Issues	30,000
DOC	State of Texas	10,000
DOC	Private individual	3,000
DOC	Sloan Foundation	200,000
COMP	Louisiana Department of Education	45,000
COMP	Air Capitol Cablevision	10,000
COMP	Unidentified area consortium	----
LIB	Kate B. Reynolds Trust Fund	25,000
LIB	Alumni group	30,000
LIB	Virginia Foundation for Independent Colleges	3,300
CJC	State educational TV	2,000
CJC	Title II	----
CJC	Department of Commerce	259,765
CJC	Title II	----
CJC	Title II	2,200
CJC	Title II	2,600
CJC	Title II	----
CJC	Title II	840
CJC	Title II	1,000
CJC	Title II	804
CJC	County Heritage Commission	500

Patterns in Personnel Levels

Respondents were asked to list the number of full-time, non-student part-time, and student part-time personnel employed at the start of the 1977-78, 1981-82, and 1982-83 academic years. Responses to the non-student part-time question did not yield meaningful information and are not reported here. However, the resulting statistics for full-time and student employees reveal

Table 19

Full Time Employees, 1982-83

Number of Employees	RES	DOC	COMP	LIB	CJC	TOT (%)
			Public			
50 +	3	0	0	0	0	3 (03)
30-49	3	2	1	0	0	6 (06)
20-29	4	4	1	0	1	10 (09)
10-19	7	3	8	1	5	24 (23)
5-9	1	7	11	1	6	26 (24)
2-4	1	3	9	1	14	28 (26)
1	0	0	5	1	3	9 (08)
0	0	0	0	0	1	1 (01)
			Private			
50 +	0	0	0	0	0	0 (00)
30-49	0	1	0	0	0	1 (01)
20-29	2	0	0	0	0	2 (02)
10-19	2	2	0	1	0	5 (06)
5-9	1	3	4	0	2	10 (12)
2-4	3	3	6	10	4	26 (31)
1	3	2	4	13	7	29 (35)
0	0	0	2	9	0	11 (13)

interesting dichotomies between public and private and "healthy" and "unhealthy" institutions.

Full-Time Employees, 1982-83. Table 19 lists the number of full-time employees, by classification and funding source, for the 1982-83 academic year. Among public institutions, 65 percent had five or more employees, while 79 percent of the staffs at private colleges and universities had fewer than five persons. Twenty-nine private institutions, or 35 percent, had only one full-time employee, including three at the research level, and 11 (13 percent) had none. Many of the media centers in the latter group were located within libraries, with the media director also holding other responsibilities. Predictably, the largest staffs are at public research and doctorate-granting universities.

Table 20

Change in Full-Time Employees,
1981-82 to 1982-83

Change	RES	DOC	COMP	LIB	CJC	TOT (%)
			Public			
+ 3 (+)	1	0	1	0	0	2 (02)
+ 2	1	2	2	0	1	6 (05)
+ 1	3	3	2	1	1	10 (09)
0	8	9	24	2	20	63 (58)
- 1	2	5	2	0	7	16 (15)
- 2	1	0	2	1	0	4 (04)
- 3 (+)	3	0	3	0	1	7 (06)
Net	-12	+2	-7	-1	-7	-25
			Private			
+ 3 (+)	0	0	0	0	0	0 (00)
+ 2	0	0	0	1	0	1 (01)
+ 1	2	3	3	1	0	9 (11)
0	8	8	10	31	13	70 (84)
- 1	0	0	2	0	0	2 (02)
- 2	0	0	1	0	0	1 (01)
- 3 (+)	1	0	0	0	0	1 (01)
Net	-2	+3	-1	+3	0	+3

Change in Full-Time Employees, 1981-82 to 1982-83. Public institutions were much more likely to add or delete media positions, particularly the latter, over this period. (See Table 20.) Only 58 percent of the public colleges and universities maintained the status quo, while 84 percent of the private schools retained their media staff size. The more startling difference is in deletions. While just four percent of the private institutions deleted positions, or did not fill vacant positions, 25 percent of their public counterparts reported position losses. The 108 public institutions responding to this question showed a net loss of 25 positions, while the 84 private colleges had a net gain of three positions.

Table 21

Change in Full Time Staff Positions
1981-82 to 1982-83,
by Healthy/Unhealthy Status

	Healthy		Unhealthy	
	PUB (%)	PRI (%)	PUB (%)	PRI (%)
Gained	17 (21)	8 (11)	1 (04)	2 (17)
Same	53 (65)	60 (83)	10 (38)	10 (83)
Lost	12 (14)	4 (06)	15 (58)	0 (00)

As Table 21 indicates, the danger of losing positions was largely confined to public media centers in the "unhealthy" category. 58 percent of these suffered position losses in 1982-83. By contrast, just 14 percent of the "healthy" state institutions reduced their media staffs. It is also interesting that none of the "unhealthy" private schools cut its media staff size.

Change in Full-Time Employees, 1977-78 to 1982-83. Two statistics stand out in the analysis of staff changes over this five-year period. One is that 40 percent of the public institutions lost more media positions than they gained, while only eight percent of the private colleges lost media positions. (See Table 22.) In fact, 12 percent of the public colleges lost five or more positions.

The other disturbing statistic is that public colleges and universities responding showed a net loss of 47 positions, while staffs at private school media centers in the sample grew by 32 positions. In fairness, it must be reported that one public research university accounted for the loss of 39 positions, trimming its full-time staff size from 100 to 61. If this single response were removed, the net loss for all public institutions

Table 22

Change in Full-Time Employees, 1977-78 to 1982-83

Change	RES	DOC	COMP	LIB	CJC	TOT (%)
			Public			
+ 10 (+)	2	0	0	0	0	2 (03)
+ 5-9	2	0	1	0	1	4 (06)
+ 1-4	2	6	6	0	3	17 (26)
0	2	2	8	0	4	16 (25)
- 1-4	2	6	5	1	5	18 (28)
- 5-9	2	0	1	0	3	6 (09)
- 10 (+)	1 (a)	0	1	0	0	2 (03)
Net	-19	-1	-2	-2	-23	-47
			Private			
+ 10 (+)	0	0	0	0	0	0 (00)
+ 5-9	0	0	0	0	0	0 (00)
+ 1-4	5	5	4	4	2	20 (41)
0	2	1	6	14	2	25 (51)
- 1-4	0	1	2	1	0	4 (08)
- 5-9	0	0	0	0	0	0 (00)
- 10 (+)	0	0	0	0	0	0 (00)
Net	+10	+8	+7	+5	+2	+32

[a] Note: One public research institution lost 39 media positions.

would be just eight positions, and the RES/PUB category would show a net gain of 20. With this in mind, it is evident that the one category in the greatest danger of losing positions is public community and junior colleges.

Once again in this case, the "unhealthy" state institutions were the most likely to suffer staff cuts. As Table 23 illustrates, 15 of the 19 "unhealthy" institutions providing this data lost positions, a substantial 78 percent. Once again, only four private colleges deleted media positions, and the losses were minimal.

Table 23

Change in Full Time Staff Positions,
1977-78 to 1982-83,
by Healthy/Unhealthy Status

	Healthy		Unhealthy	
	PUB (%)	PRI (%)	PUB (%)	PRI (%)
Gained	21 (46)	18 (43)	2 (11)	2 (29)
Same	14 (30)	20 (48)	2 (11)	5 (71)
Lost	11 (24)	4 (09)	15 (78)	0 (00)

Titles of Full-Time Positions Added and Deleted, 1977-82. Data collected for these two questions were disappointing. Many respondents did not make the effort to answer them properly. For example, it was noted often that the number of positions listed did not match the changes in staff size reported. In some cases this item was left blank, although changes in staff size had been reported.

In addition, such a wide variety of position titles were listed that the Task Force grouped them into more general categories to make the aggregate meaningful. In many cases it was difficult to infer actual work responsibilities from the job title provided. However, considering that the same basic criteria were applied to both additions and deletions, some interesting trends do emerge.

Table 24 contains a summary of position changes. It appears that many media directors may have met the mandate of budget reductions by eliminating administrative and/or technical personnel. These two categories had the highest deletion rates and lowest addition rates, excluding instructional development, which had few positions either added or deleted. Production personnel apparently received the greatest protection, with 44 positions added

Table 24

Full-Time Positions Added and Eliminated, 1977 to 1982

	Added		Eliminated	
Category	N	%	N	%
Administrative	15	11	25	22
Production	44	33	20	18
Clerical	40	30	25	22
Technical	33	25	39	35
Instructional Development	1	01	3	03

and just 20 eliminated among the responding institutions. Many of the new production jobs were created for video specialists.

It is also interesting that four director and one assistant director positions were lost, while two director and six assistant director posts were added. Analysis of instutution classifications reveals no pattern.

Number of Student Employees. Data on the number of student workers employed during this period may be found in Tables 25-27. Readers are advised to consider these statistics with caution, because the Task Force neglected to request information related to average number of hours worked and source of the funds. Without these referents, student employment figures are relatively meaningless. For example, three students could work 20 hours per week each, while 10 students could work six hours per week each. The total amount of labor would be the same, but in one instance seven more students had been employed than in the other.

The fact that private institutions have hired greater numbers of students during the past five years most likely reflects the need for these colleges to provide financial aid, thus helping to offset the relatively higher costs of attending these schools. As

Table 25

Number of Student Employees, 1982-83

Number	RES	DOC	COMP	LIB	CJC	TOT (%)
			Public			
50 +	2	4	1	0	0	7 (07)
30-49	9	4	9	0	2	24 (24)
20-29	5	2	1	1	3	12 (12)
10-19	2	4	9	0	7	22 (22)
5-9	0	2	8	0	4	14 (14)
1-4	1	3	3	2	10	19 (19)
0	0	0	0	0	1	1 (01)
			Private			
50 +	2	1	0	0	0	3 (04)
30-49	1	1	0	2	0	4 (05)
20-29	2	6	2	1	2	13 (16)
10-19	4	2	4	7	2	19 (23)
5-9	1	1	4	11	3	20 (25)
1-4	1	0	4	8	5	18 (22)
0	1	0	0	2	1	4 (05)

Table 26

Change in Student Employees, 1981-82 to 1982-83

Change	RES	DOC	COMP	LIB	CJC	TOT (%)
			Public			
+ 10 (+)	1	1	0	0	0	2 (02)
+ 5-9	1	1	0	1	0	3 (03)
+ 1-4	4	1	7	1	6	19 (20)
0	10	10	15	1	15	51 (53)
- 1-4	0	3	4	0	2	9 (09)
- 5-9	1	2	3	0	2	8 (08)
- 10 (+)	2	1	1	0	0	4 (04)
Net	+8	-2	-28	+6	-2	-18
			Private			
+ 10 (+)	1	0	0	1	0	2 (03)
+ 5-9	1	2	0	0	0	3 (04)
+ 1-4	2	5	0	6	4	17 (22)
0	8	4	12	20	7	51 (65)
- 1-4	0	0	1	3	1	5 (06)
- 5-9	0	0	0	0	0	0 (00)
- 10 (+)	0	0	0	0	0	0 (00)
Net	+19	+18	-2	+28	+3	+66

Table 27

Change in Student Employees,
1977-78 to 1982-83

Change	RES	DOC	COMP	LIB	CJC	TOT (%)
			Public			
+ 10 (+)	3	2	1	0	0	6 (10)
+ 5-9	3	1	3	0	0	7 (12)
+ 1-4	0	2	3	1	3	9 (15)
0	1	2	3	0	5	11 (18)
- 1-4	2	2	4	0	4	12 (20)
- 5-9	1	2	0	0	1	4 (07)
- 10 (+)	3	3	3	0	2	11 (18)
Net	-18	-8	-13	+2	-35	-72
			Private			
+ 10 (+)	2	3	1	0	0	6 (14)
+ 5-9	0	2	1	4	0	7 (16)
+ 1-4	1	2	4	5	2	14 (33)
0	4	0	1	5	0	10 (23)
- 1-4	1	0	2	2	1	6 (14)
- 5-9	0	0	0	0	0	0 (00)
- 10 (+)	0	0	0	0	0	0 (00)
Net	+68	+62	+25	+32	+3	+190

Note: One public research institution lost 43 student media positions; one private research institution gained 56 student media positions.

a result, student positions have been created throughout the institutions, with media centers being merely one of the beneficiaries of student labor. In fact, in view of the small permanent staff size at many private colleges, it is quite probable that student employees are viewed by administrators as equivalent to full-time staff positions.

Likewise, many students are paid from Federal work-study grants and other external funding sources. Therefore, the funds allocated for student employees do not necessarily represent a direct institutional commitment to the media program.

Patterns in Moral Support

Respondents were asked to assess the current level of moral support, or the degree of personal commitment to the media program, provided by the media director's immediate supervisor, the next higher echelon supervisor, and the faculty in general. This is a purely subjective appraisal that reflects the director's perception of how the media center is supported by others.

In some cases this perception may be soured by personality conflicts or artifically enhanced by a reluctance to admit lack of support by superiors and/or clients. The degree of closeness of the supervision may also flavor the director's perception. Nonetheless, in the aggregate these data permit us to paint a fairly clear picture. Moral support in general appears to be quite high, even if the financial support is not. This finding is evidence that administrators respect and value media programs, and it provides hope that better days may be ahead if budgetary hurdles can be overcome.

Nature of Moral Support. Tables 28-33 summarize the current nature of moral support reported by media directors. The uniformity of opinion here is striking. Only four respondents viewed their immediate supervisor as moderately hostile and none as extremely hostile. Slightly more, a total of eight, second echelon administrators were perceived as moderately hostile, but, again, none were considered extremely hostile. Only three directors considered their faculty to be moderately hostile. One director viewed professors on his campus to be extremely hostile, and this was at the center that closed shortly after the data were

Table 28

Nature of Moral Support, Immediate Supervisor -- Public Institutions

	N	(1) EXTRM SUPTV	(2) MOD SUPTV	(3) INDIF	(4) MOD HOSTL	(5) EXTRM HOSTL	$\bar{X}$
				Healthy			
RES	16	9	5	2	0	0	1.56
DOC	13	7	5	1	0	0	1.54
COMP	29	14	15	0	0	0	1.52
LIB	3	3	0	0	0	0	1.00
CJC	20	12	8	0	0	0	1.40
TOT	81	45	33	3	0	0	1.48
				Unhealthy			
RES	3	1	2	0	0	0	1.67
DOC	6	1	5	0	0	0	1.83
COMP	10	2	3	2	3	0	2.60
LIB	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00
CJC	9	5	4	0	0	0	1.44
TOT	29	9	15	2	3	0	1.97

Table 29

Nature of Moral Support, Immediate Supervisor -- Private Institutions

	N	(1) EXTRM SUPTV	(2) MOD SUPTV	(3) INDIF	(4) MOD HOSTL	(5) EXTRM HOSTL	$\bar{X}$
				Healthy			
RES	9	4	4	1	0	0	1.67
DOC	9	4	4	1	0	0	1.67
COMP	15	10	3	2	0	0	1.47
LIB	28	17	9	2	0	0	1.46
CJC	10	4	6	0	0	0	1.60
TOT	71	39	26	6	0	0	1.53
				Unhealthy			
RES	3	1	1	0	1	0	2.33
DOC	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00
COMP	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00
LIB	5	3	2	0	0	0	1.40
CJC	2	1	1	0	0	0	1.50
TOT	13	7	4	1	1	0	1.69

Table 30

Nature of Moral Support,
Next Higher Echelon Supervisor --
Public Institutions

	N	(1) EXTRM SUPTV	(2) MOD SUPTV	(3) INDIF	(4) MOD HOSTL	(5) EXTRM HOSTL	$\bar{X}$
			Healthy				
RES	16	5	7	4	0	0	1.94
DOC	13	3	10	0	0	0	1.77
COMP	28	8	18	2	0	0	1.79
LIB	3	3	0	0	0	0	1.00
CJC	20	6	11	3	0	0	1.70
TOT	80	25	46	9	0	0	1.80
			Unhealthy				
RES	3	0	2	0	1	0	2.67
DOC	6	0	4	1	1	0	2.50
COMP	10	1	4	3	2	0	2.60
LIB	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00
CJC	9	3	4	2	0	0	1.89
TOT	29	4	15	6	4	0	2.34

Table 31

Nature of Moral Support,
Next Higher Echelon Supervisor --
Private Institutions

	N	(1) EXTRM SUPTV	(2) MOD SUPTV	(3) INDIF	(4) MOD HOSTL	(5) EXTRM HOSTL	$\bar{X}$
			Healthy				
RES	9	3	4	2	0	0	1.89
DOC	9	1	5	2	1	0	2.33
COMP	14	7	4	3	0	0	1.71
LIB	27	9	15	2	1	0	1.81
CJC	9	3	5	1	0	0	1.78
TOT	68	23	33	10	2	0	1.87
			Unhealthy				
RES	3	2	0	0	1	0	2.00
DOC	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00
COMP	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00
LIB	5	1	3	0	1	0	2.20
CJC	2	1	1	0	0	0	1.50
TOT	13	4	5	2	2	0	2.15

Table 32

Nature of Moral Support, Faculty in General -- Public Institutions

	N	(1) EXTRM SUPTV	(2) MOD SUPTV	(3) INDIF	(4) MOD HOSTL	(5) EXTRM HOSTL	$\bar{X}$
			Healthy				
RES	16	3	10	3	0	0	2.00
DOC	13	2	9	2	0	0	2.00
COMP	28	9	14	5	0	0	1.86
LIB	3	3	0	0	0	0	1.00
CJC	20	6	9	4	1	0	2.00
TOT	80	23	42	14	1	0	1.91
			Unhealthy				
RES	3	1	2	0	0	0	1.67
DOC	6	1	3	1	1	0	2.33
COMP	10	4	4	1	0	1	2.00
LIB	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00
CJC	9	2	6	1	0	0	1.89
TOT	29	9	15	3	1	1	1.97

Table 33

Nature of Moral Support, Faculty in General -- Private Institutions

	N	(1) EXTRM SUPTV	(2) MOD SUPTV	(3) INDIF	(4) MOD HOSTL	(5) EXTRM HOSTL	$\bar{X}$
			Healthy				
RES	9	0	9	0	0	0	2.00
DOC	9	2	4	3	0	0	2.11
COMP	14	7	6	1	0	0	1.57
LIB	28	13	13	1	1	0	1.64
CJC	10	2	5	3	0	0	2.10
TOT	70	24	37	8	1	0	1.80
			Unhealthy				
RES	3	1	1	1	0	0	2.00
DOC	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00
COMP	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00
LIB	5	0	4	1	0	0	2.20
CJC	2	1	1	0	0	0	1.50
TOT	13	2	7	4	0	0	2.15

collected.

No significant patterns appear to be present. Most (but not all) of the "somewhat hostile" assessments came from "unhealthy" media centers. Their numbers, however, are so few that it seems improper to suggest that unsupportive supervisors and professors are characteristic of unhealthy media programs. Among "healthy" media centers, the more strongly the institutional focus is on teaching rather than research, such as in liberal arts and two-year colleges, the greater the degree of moral support, particularly among the faculty.

"Unhealthy" public comprehensive institutions appear to receive a slightly lower level of administrative support, and "unhealthy" institutions in general receive the lowest level of support from second echelon administrators. The mean support levels among "unhealthy" institutions is lower than that for "healthy" institions in all six Tables. Nonetheless, near absence of negative responses to these questions indicates that the overall level of moral support is quite favorable among all three groups.

Trend in Moral Support. Trend data, summarized in Tables 34-39, need to be considered from a slightly different perspective. "Same" responses are not undesirable if the level of support was initially high. The generally lower means for this set of Tables merely reflect a relatively high incidence of "Same" trend assessments and should not be viewed with alarm.

The number of negative responses here is slightly higher. Four respondents noted a slight deterioration in relations with immediate superiors, and two more saw this deterioration as rapid. With the next higher level supervisors, eight respondents perceived

Table 34

Trend in Moral Support, Immediate Supervisor -- Public Institutions

	N	(1) IMPRV RAPID	(2) IMPRV SLGHT	(3) SAME	(4) DETER SLGHT	(5) DETER RAPID	$\bar{X}$
				Healthy			
RES	16	3	5	8	0	0	2.31
DOC	13	2	9	2	0	0	2.00
COMP	29	8	11	10	0	0	2.07
LIB	3	3	0	0	0	0	1.00
CJC	20	10	7	3	0	0	1.65
TOT	81	26	32	23	0	0	1.96
				Unhealthy			
RES	3	1	0	2	0	0	2.33
DOC	6	0	2	4	0	0	2.67
COMP	10	1	2	4	1	2	3.10
LIB	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00
CJC	9	2	3	4	0	0	2.22
TOT	29	4	8	14	1	2	2.62

Table 35

Trend in Moral Support, Immediate Supervisor -- Private Institutions

	N	(1) IMPRV RAPID	(2) IMPRV SLGHT	(3) SAME	(4) DETER SLGHT	(5) DETER RAPID	$\bar{X}$
				Healthy			
RES	9	1	5	2	1	0	2.33
DOC	9	3	2	4	0	0	2.11
COMP	15	6	4	4	1	0	2.00
LIB	28	11	6	11	0	0	2.00
CJC	10	3	5	2	0	0	1.90
TOT	71	24	22	23	2	0	2.04
				Unhealthy			
RES	3	1	0	1	1	0	2.67
DOC	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00
COMP	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00
LIB	5	1	3	1	0	0	2.00
CJC	2	1	1	0	0	0	1.50
TOT	13	4	4	4	1	0	2.15

Table 36

Trend in Moral Support,
Next Higher Echelon Supervisor --
Public Institutions

	N	(1) IMPRV RAPID	(2) IMPRV SLGHT	(3) SAME	(4) DETER SLGHT	(5) DETER RAPID	$\bar{X}$
				Healthy			
RES	16	3	5	7	1	0	2.38
DOC	13	0	8	5	0	0	2.38
COMP	28	8	8	12	0	0	2.14
LIB	3	3	0	0	0	0	1.00
CJC	20	7	8	3	2	0	2.00
TOT	80	21	29	27	3	0	2.15
				Unhealthy			
RES	3	0	1	2	0	0	2.67
DOC	6	0	3	2	0	1	2.83
COMP	10	1	1	6	1	1	3.00
LIB	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00
CJC	9	3	0	6	0	0	2.33
TOT	29	4	5	17	1	2	2.72

Table 37

Trend in Moral Support,
Next Higher Echelon Supervisor --
Private Institutions

	N	(1) IMPRV RAPID	(2) IMPRV SLGHT	(3) SAME	(4) DETER SLGHT	(5) DETER RAPID	$\bar{X}$
				Healthy			
RES	9	1	4	3	1	0	2.44
DOC	9	2	0	7	0	0	2.56
COMP	14	5	5	3	1	0	2.00
LIB	27	8	6	12	1	0	2.22
CJC	9	3	2	4	0	0	2.11
TOT	68	19	17	29	3	0	2.23
				Unhealthy			
RES	3	1	1	0	1	0	2.33
DOC	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50
COMP	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00
LIB	5	1	2	1	0	1	2.60
CJC	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00
TOT	13	3	4	4	1	1	2.46

Table 38

Trend in Moral Support, Faculty in General -- Public Institutions

	N	(1) IMPRV RAPID	(2) IMPRV SLGHT	(3) SAME	(4) DETER SLGHT	(5) DETER RAPID	$\bar{X}$
				Healthy			
RES	16	5	4	7	0	0	2.13
DOC	13	1	7	5	0	0	2.31
COMP	28	5	13	9	1	0	2.21
LIB	3	3	0	0	0	0	1.00
CJC	20	6	9	4	1	0	2.00
TOT	80	20	33	25	2	0	2.11
				Unhealthy			
RES	3	0	1	1	1	0	3.00
DOC	6	0	1	4	1	0	3.00
COMP	10	0	5	3	1	1	2.80
LIB	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00
CJC	9	0	3	6	0	0	2.67
TOT	29	1	10	14	3	1	2.76

Table 39

Trend in Moral Support, Faculty in General -- Private Institutions

	N	(1) IMPRV RAPID	(2) IMPRV SLGHT	(3) SAME	(4) DETER SLGHT	(5) DETER RAPID	$\bar{X}$
				Healthy			
RES	9	0	7	2	0	0	2.22
DOC	9	4	2	2	1	0	2.00
COMP	14	5	6	3	0	0	1.64
LIB	28	13	12	2	1	0	1.68
CJC	10	2	5	3	0	0	1.80
TOT	70	24	32	12	2	0	1.89
				Unhealthy			
RES	3	1	1	1	0	0	2.00
DOC	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50
COMP	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00
LIB	5	1	2	2	0	0	2.20
CJC	2	1	0	1	0	0	2 00
TOT	13	3	3	6	1	0	2.38

the deterioration as slight and three as rapid. Eight saw slight and two viewed rapid derioration in relations with faculty members. In several cases respondents reported worsening conditions at more than one level.

As with the set of questions above, the significance here is in the near uniformity of positive responses. Overall, 64 percent feel that relations with immediate supervisors are improving. Fifty-four percent shared the opinion toward next higher echelon administrators, as did 66 percent toward faculty. Again, the more positive trends were noted in categories where the institutional mission emphasizes teaching, rather than research.

"Unhealthy" colleges and universities, as a group, reported a less positive trend than "healthy" institutions, particularly among the comprehensive schools, and "unhealthy" public institutions have less positive trend means than "unhealthy" private colleges.

Contrast Between Librarian/Non Librarian Supervisor

It was the hope of the Task Force that such factors as funding and staffing patterns and levels of moral support could be correlated with position titles of immediate supervisors to determine if media directors serving under librarians and non-librarians are treated differentially.

Regretfully, position titles of superiors could not be used to determine which were serving as professional librarians and which were not. Frequently it could not be ascertained from the supervisor's campus unit whether or not that unit housed the

circulating collection as well as those traditional "audiovisual" services. Supervisors identified as "Director", or "Dean", "Learning Resource Center", could be either librarians or educational technologists.

However, based on a careful analysis of responses, The Task Force developed the following broad generalizations. No evidence was found to support the idea that, in general, media centers subordinate to librarians are any better or worse off than those subordinate to other administrators. Librarian supervisors apparently are less likely to cut budgets, and when they do, the cut is likely to be less severe. Conversely, librarian administrators appear to be less likely to increase budgets, but the raises are likely to be more generous. Trend and current status of media center health assessments appear to be nearly identical for the two groups. Trend and nature of moral support data appear to be slightly more positive for librarian supervisors, but the differences may not be statistically significant.

Since these conclusions are based solely on calculated estimates of the supervisor's sphere of responsibility in at least 25 cases, it is inappropriate to provide specific data. Further research in this area is necessary before legitimate conclusions can be drawn.

Names of Media Centers

A problem encountered throughout this survey is that media centers in higher education are known by a wide variety of functional titles. In fact, 54 unique titles were identified

Table 40
Names of Media Centers Responding to Survey

Name	N
Academic Media Center	1
Alumni Media Center	1
Audio Visual/Audiovisual/AV Center	20
Audio Visual and Photo Center	1
Audio Visual Department	9
Audio Visual Instruction Center	1
Audio Visual Lab	1
Audio Visual Library	1
Audio Visual Media Center	1
Audio Visual Media Services	1
Audio Visual Resource Center	1
Audio Visual Resources	1
Audio Visual Services	14
Audio Visual Services Division	1
Center for Educational Media and Technology	1
Center for Instructional Media Services	1
Center for Instructional Services	
Communication Media Center	1
Department of Educational Media	1
Department of Educational Media Services	1
Department of Instructional Media Resources	1
Division of Communications Services	1
Educational Communications Center	1
Educational Communications Division	1
Educational Media Center	6
Educational Media Services	3
Instructional Aids	1
Instructional Development Center Media Library	1
Instructional Materials Center	2
Instructional Media Center	14
Instructional Media Service(s)	4
Instructional Resource(s) Center	5
Instructional Services Center	2
Instructional Support Center	1
Instructional Systems Center	1
Learning Materials Center	1
Learning Media Center	1
Learning Resource(s) Center	22
Library	6
Library/Learning Center	1
Library/Learning Resources Center	1
Library/Media Center	3
Media Center	24
Media Communications Center	1
Media Learning Center	1
Media Office	1
Media Resource(s) Center	4
Media Services	15
Media Services Office	1
Nonprint Media Center	1
Office of Instructional Services and Educational Research	1
Office of Learning Resources	2
University Media Center	1
University Media Services	2

among the 196 respondents. These are listed in Table 40. The lack of standardization may well reflect the lack of a universally accepted identity for our profession and may result in confusion among potential clients moving from one institution to another.

Computing Services Provided

Respondents were asked if their media centers provide any kind of instructional computing service. Table 41 illustrates the breakdown of responses by classification, funding source, and media center health. Overall, only about 22 percent reported

Table 41

Prevalence of Media Centers
Offering Instructional Computing Services

	Public		Private		Total	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
			Healthy			
RES	8	8	2	7	10	15
DOC	5	8	3	7	8	15
COMP	8	21	3	12	11	33
LIB	1	2	3	25	4	27
CJC	3	17	1	10	4	27
TOT	25	56	12	61	37	117
(%)	(31)	(69)	(16)	(84)	(24)	(76)
			Unhealthy			
RES	0	3	0	3	0	6
DOC	1	5	0	2	1	7
COMP	1	9	0	1	1	10
LIB	0	1	1	4	1	5
CJC	3	6	0	2	3	8
TOT	5	24	1	12	6	36
(%)	(17)	(83)	(08)	(92)	(14)	(86)

Table 42

Computing Services Offered
by Media Centers Surveyed

Service	N
CAI/Microcomputer lab	23
Loan of computer equipment	6
Offer workshops/classes on computers	5
Computer programming services	4
Computer graphics capability	3
Test service/test grading	3
Software library	2
Resource center for information	1
PLATO capability	1
Repair of microcomputers	1

activity in this area. This is a rather misleading statistic. Table 42 lists the kinds of computing services offered. Just 49 different entries were made by all respondents to this question, but the total number of institutions reporting computer-related services is 43. We can therefore conclude that college media centers were minimally involved in instructional computing in 1982-83. Even some responding in the affirmative offered only the most fragmentary of services, such as "one microcomputer for faculty use", period. On the other hand, one public doctorate-granting university recently merged its computing and media services.

It must be observed that the information in Table 42 was solicited by a free response question. Had a more precise and extensive line of questioning been possible in the survey form, greater activity in instructional computing may have been revealed. This is a subject requiring further research.

Table 43

Frequency of Media Centers Producing
Instructional Materials for Off-Campus Use

	Public		Private		Total	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
RES	9	10	4	8	13	18
DOC	7	12	2	10	9	22
COMP	14	25	4	12	18	37
LIB	1	3	4	29	5	32
CJC	12	17	2	11	14	28
TOT	43	67	16	70	59	137
(%)	(39)	(61)	(19)	(81)	(30)	(70)

Support of Distance Learning

Respondents were also asked to indicate if their media centers were involved in the production of course materials for or delivery of instruction to off-campus students receiving credit at their institutions, and, if so, what delivery formats were employed. The purpose was to determine how many media centers support distance learning programs that reach students who may otherwise not be enrolled, thus increasing F.T.E.

Approximately 30 percent of the respondents indicated activity in this area, although the involvement of many appears to be minimal. Public institutions were much more likely than private colleges to report such activity, as illustrated in Table 43. Table 44 lists the formats in which this instruction was delivered The greatest activity appears to be in producing or circulating instructional video tapes, although a significant number have some form of connection with cable television.

Table 44

Delivery Systems Utilized
for Off-Campus Instruction
Involving Media Center Participation

Delivery System	N
Circulating video tapes	37
Cable TV	30
Open circuit TV	12
ITFS	10
Computer	7
Dial-access audio	6
Audio tape	6
Radio	5
Live telephone	3
Satellite	3
Self-instructional packages	2
Closed circuit TV	1

Promotion of Media Services

Most media centers actively promote themselves, as indicated by Table 45. Actually, a higher percentage of "unhealthy" media centers is involved in these activities than for "healthy" centers -- 90 percent to 85 percent. Flyers and brochures are the most common public relations technique (see Table 46), followed by workshops, visibility of media staff through service on institutional committees, and publication of a newsletter. Surprisingly, only nine percent sponsor a periodic media fair.

It is likely that some of the techniques written in the free response portion of this question are employed by many media centers. The actual extent and ways in which they are used are topics for future research.

Table 45

Incidence of Media Centers
Actively Promoting Their Services (a)

	Public		Private		Total	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
RES	15	1	8	1	23	2
DOC	16	0	7	2	23	2
COMP	24	4	8	4	32	8
LIB	3	0	18	4	21	4
CJC	17	2	4	1	21	3
TOT	75	7	45	12	120	19
(%)	(91)	(09)	(80)	(20)	(86)	(14)

[a] Note: This item was not included in the telephone survey.

Table 46

Prevalence of Media Center Promotion Techniques[a]

	N	%[b]
Flyers/brochures	94	78
Workshops	66	55
Service on institution committees	62	52
Newsletter	49	41
Media fair	11	09
Honor media users	2	02

Note: The following techniques were written in.

Announcements at faculty meetings
Self-evaluation questionnaires
"Personal evalgelism"
Software catalog
Record of success/service sells itself
Orientation to new faculty
Film festivals
Displays in high traffic areas
Open house
Printouts of services
Press releases
Preview service
Annual report

[a] Note: This item was not included in the telephone survey.

[b] Note: % is percent of respondents indicating that their centers employ public relations strategies.

Table 47

Incidence of Media Centers Hurt
by On-Campus Competition (a)

	Public		Private		Total	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
RES	3	13	0	8	3	21
DOC	3	13	3	4	6	17
COMP	11	17	1	10	12	27
LIB	0	2	1	19	1	21
CJC	0	19	0	4	0	23
TOT	17	54	5	45	22	109
(%)	(24)	(76)	(10)	(90)	(17)	(83)

a
Note: This item was not included in the telephone survey.

Campus Competition

Respondents were asked if their media centers were being hurt by competition from departmental or other special purpose media operations on campus. In general, there were few affirmative responses to this question. (See Table 47.) However, 39 percent of those in the public comprehensive classification responded yes. Since these institutions typically support smaller media programs, these centers may therefore be more vulnerable to competition from departmental resource centers found in health science, education, and other disciplines.

Most Serious Challenges

Table 48 lists media directors' perceptions of the most serious challenges facing their centers. Thirty-eight percent of the

Table 48

Respondents' Perceptions of Most Serious Challenges Facing Their Media Centers

	N[a]
Budget cuts/inadequate budget	52
Rebuilding/expanding hardware/software collection	29
Lack/loss of personnel	22
Getting involved in new technologies	17
Maintaining/expanding services with reduced resources	14
Lack of space/inadequate facilities	13
Increasing demand for services/non-use of services	12
Expanding/rejuvenating services	8
Need to convince superiors of value of service	7
Need to generate income/obtain grants	5
State fiscal problems/weak state economy	5
Director's time fragmented by other responsibilities	4
Improving production capability	3
Survival/fighting off closure attempts	3
Insensitive administration/lack of institutional leadership	3
Merger/possible merger with library	3
Need for organizational development	3
Need for instructional development service	3
Maintaining staff morale	2
Maintaining equipment	2
Competition from other campus agencies	2
Dealing with copyright law	2
Training faculty in media use	1
Promotion/public relations	1
Planning for future	1

[a] Note: Total N responding to this item was 138. Multiple responses were possible.

respondents specifically mentioned budget cuts or a budget inadequate to meet their center's mission, and budget-related concerns dominated the remainder of the list. Since the list was developed from answers to a free response question, it is likely that many of these challenges are shared by other respondents who did not think to report them.

Case Histories

Responses were invited to provide narrative accounts, for the record, of their experiences and frustrations in dealing with crises during the recent past. Anonymity was guaranteed. These reports are reprinted verbatim in Appendix E.

Questions Not Analyzed

The following questionnaire items were not analyzed due to the lack of meaningful input:

Question 2 - official title of media director

Question 6 - 1972-73 budget and personnel data

Question 6 - part-time, non student employees

Recommendations

The Task Force makes the following recommendations to the DEMM and AECT leadership with full recognition of the Association's current fiscal plight. It is acknowledged that action requiring significant funding would have to wait until AECT's financial health has improved. On the other hand, implementation of some of these proposals may directly result in increased revenues and help solve some of the Association's financial problems.

Recommendation #1. AECT and DEMM should place a much greater emphasis on delivering professional development training to practitioners at the local, state, and regional levels. Establishing and promoting an AECT speakers' bureau, providing

greater support to Regional Coordinators, and improving liaison with State Affiliates for the purpose of providing program support are three vital steps that can be taken.

Recommendation #2: AECT should develop a comprehensive directory listing the center title and address and names, titles, and telephone numbers of key personnel in every media center, centralized and specialized, in every institution of higher education in the United States. Such a directory would provide a superb mailing list and would be invaluable in the execution of future research. The Association's commercial members should be approached for funding, since this directory would greatly assist their marketing efforts.

Recommendation #3: AECT and DEMM should sponsor a symposium, possibly to be held in conjunction with the national convention, to focus the role of the media center in academic computing. What should this role be vis-a-vis that of the campus computer center? What can the media director do to ensure that this role is complementary? What computing services should a media center provide, and how can they be started?

Recommendation #4: As advertising revenues shift the burden of publishing Media Management Journal from the DEMM budget, the Division should develop a series of Media Management Monographs providing insightful, directly relevant, high quality essays on topics of concern to practitioners. Topics could include basic management skills, public relations techniques, copyright, and revenue generation. The national office should publish and market the monographs.

Recommendation #5: DEMM should also devote a portion of its annual budget to sponsoring research in the field of media management. No literature review is included in this report because the only recent citations available are isolated doctoral dissertations of marginal relevance to this study. Several topics for future research have been proposed in this report.

Recommendation #6: This study has identified several unique and highly successful media programs. DEMM should develop case histories of these media centers, emphasizing the formulas for success, and publish them singly in Media Management Journal and collectively through the national office's non-periodical publications program.

Recommendation #7: AECT and DEMM should place a high emphasis on programming in the following areas. This training must be comprehensive and intense, and it should be capable of being implemented in any state.

1. Basic budget protection.
2. Identification and acquisition of grant funds.
3. Techniques for generating income.
4. Reallocation of resources.

Recommendation #8: AECT and DEMM should establish a committee to study the lack of standardization of functional titles among media centers in higher education, determine if important implications exist, and make recommendations as appropriate.

Recommendation #9: Many of the respondents with unique success stories indicated willingness to share these experiences in AECT conference sessions. DEMM should give serious consideration to

how these presentations can be used most effectively at the national convention and also promoted to State Affiliates for their conferences.

References

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. A classification of institutions of higher education (revised edition). Berkeley, Calif.: Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, 1976.

General news. NUCEA Newsletter, October 1983, p. 3.

Magarrell, J. Recession hits state support for colleges. Chronicle of Higher Education, October 20, 1982, pp. 1, 6-8.

Appendix A

DEMM Task Force on the
Status of Media Centers in Higher Education

Russell F. Adkins, Wichita State University
Michael J. Albright, Iowa State University (chair)
Samuel L. Atmore, Colby College
Mark O. Berger, Wichita State University
William A. Broderick, San Diego State University
Philip Brody, University of Kansas
Richard F. Cullins, Trident Technical College
James L. Dague, John Carroll University
Patricia Fewell, Illinois State University
Robert A. Gray, George Mason University
Steven Hagstrom, Ferris State College
Stanley A. Huffman, Jr., Virginia Tech
Joseph A. Hutchinson, Louisiana State University
Herbert L. Johnson, McPherson College
Charles H. Kemp, Oregon Institute of Technology
Jean T. Kreamer, University of Southwestern Louisiana
Rebecca Lawrence, Northwestern (La.) State University
Stanley T. Lewis, Queens College (N.Y.)
Lynn K. Milet, Lehigh University (asst. chair)
Donald E. Nelson, University of Deleware
John R. Stephens, Jr., University of Georgia (asst. chair)
Ann E. Tortorelli, Community College of Allegheny County
Patricia A. Vint, Madonna College

Appendix B

AECT/DEMM SURVEY
on the
STATUS OF MEDIA CENTERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Institution_____

I. Administrative Structure and Support

1. What is the official name of your media center (i.e., learning resource center, audiovisual center, etc.)?

_____

2. What is the official title of your media center's director?

_____

3. To whom does the media director report? Please identify (by title only, not by name) the next two senior positions in the institution's administrative structure.

Media director's immediate supervisor_____

Next higher echelon supervisor_____

4. How would you characterize the trend in moral support provided by the following persons? Use the scale 1 = improving rapidly, 2 = improving slightly, 3 = holding about the same, 4 = deteriorating slightly, 5 = deteriorating rapidly.

_____ the media director's immediate supervisor
_____ the next higher echelon supervisor
_____ the faculty in general

5. How would you characterize the nature of moral support currently provided by these persons? Use the scale 1 = extremely supportive, 2 = moderately supportive, 3 = indifferent, 4 = somewhat hostile, and 5 = extremely hostile.

_____ the media director's immediate supervisor
_____ the next higher echelon supervisor
_____ the faculty in general

II. Budget and Services

6. Please enter the appropriate figures for each of the academic years indicated. Estimate for 1982-83 if necessary. Enter N/A if the figures are not available.

	1972-73	1977-78	1981-82	1982-83
a. What was the size of your total media center budget, including salaries?	_____	_____	_____	_____

6. (cont'd)	1972-72	1977-78	1981-82	1982-83
b. How many persons were employed full-time in your media center at the start of these years?	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. How many part-time non-student individuals were employed at the start of these years?	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. How many part-time students were employed at the start of these years?	_____	_____	_____	_____

7. Please list the job titles of non-student positions (at least 50% time) in your media center that have been deleted since 1977-78. In parentheses following each job title, indicate the number of positions that have been eliminated; i.e., equipment technician (2).

8. Using the same criteria and directions as in question #7 above, list the job titles of non-student positions added since 1977-78. Include positions that you anticipate adding by the beginning of the 1983-84 school year.

9. Did your media center generate revenue (through film rentals, charges for services, etc.) in 1981-82? Yes_____ No_____
If yes, what was the approximate amount generated by all activities combined?
_____

10. Please check those activities that generated revenue for your media center in 1981-82. Write in other significant sources of self-generated revenue.

____ charges for services
____ rentals of films/tapes
____ sales of films/tapes
____ sales of supplies (blank tapes, etc.)
____ equipment rentals
____ (other)_____
____ (other)_____
____ (other)_____

11. What percentage of this self-generated revenue was retained for expenditure by your media center?
_____

12. If the percentage listed in #11 above was less than 100%, what happened to the balance?

13. Please list the funding source, amount, and purpose of all current grants received by your media center. List only grants obtained from off-campus sources.

14. Is your media center directly involved in the production of course materials for or delivery of instruction to off-campus students receiving credit at your institution? Yes_____ No_____

15. If yes, please check the format(s) by which this instruction is delivered to students.

_____ open-circuit TV	_____ dial-access audio
_____ cable TV	_____ live telephone
_____ ITFS	_____ radio
_____ circulating video tapes	_____ satellite
_____ computer	_____ (other)_____

16. Does your media center provide any kind of instructional computing service? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, please briefly describe it:

17. How do you assess the current health of your media center as compared with 1977-78?

_____ considerably improved
_____ somewhat improved
_____ about the same
_____ somewhat deteriorated
_____ considerably deteriorated

18. How would you characterize the general health of your media center at this time?

_____ very healthy
_____ somewhat healthy
_____ in some trouble
_____ in deep trouble

19. If you indicated that your media center is healthy (either very or somewhat), to what do you attribute its health?

20. If you indicated that your media center is in some trouble (either some or deep), to what do you attribute this difficulty?

21. What are the most serious challenges currently facing your media center?

22. Do you feel that your media center has been hurt by "competition" from other media operations on campus, such as departmental learning resource centers? Yes_____ No_____

23. How does your media center promote itself? Please check those that apply; write in additional techniques.

_____ flyers/brochures sent to faculty/administration
_____ faculty workshops in media use
_____ periodic media fair on campus
_____ periodic newsletter sent to faculty/administration
_____ honor media users; i.e. "mediator of the month"
_____ media personnel serve on institutional committees
-- which committees?_____
_____
_____ (other)_____
_____ (other)_____

III. Professional Support and Development

24. Do you feel that there is anything that a professional organization (such as AECT or ALA) could have done to help resolve or lessen the severity of problems you have faced during the past five years? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, please describe briefly what you feel could have been done.

25. Would your media center benefit if AECT established an accreditation program to promote quality control of graduating media specialists? Probably yes_____ Probably no_____

26. Would your media center benefit if AECT established a certification program to certify the competence of practicing media specialists? Probably yes_____ Probably no_____

27. Have you found any of AECT's non-periodical publications to be of particular value in strengthening your media program or improving the qualifications of your employees? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, please identify those publications.

28. In what management skill areas do you and members of your staff feel the greatest need for more training? Use the following scale: 1 = high need, 2 = moderate need, 3 = little or no need. Use the blanks below to enter additional management skill areas to which you would assign a "1" rating.

____ budgeting	____ applications of new tech.
____ personnel management	____ formal writing
____ equipment management	____ evaluation
____ consulting skills	____ goal setting
____ grantsmanship	____ public relations skills
____ assertiveness trng.	____ _____
____ leadership training	____ _____
____ marketing	____ _____

29. If AECT/DEMM developed programs designed to help you or members of your staff function more effectively or improve the status of your media center, what would be the most effective means of providing this information to you? Check all those that apply.

____ teleconferences	____ two-week national workshops
____ AECT publications	____ one-week national workshops
____ AECT convention sessions	____ two-week regional workshops
	____ one-week regional workshops
____ state affiliate conf. sessions	____ (other)_____
	____ (other)_____

IV. General

30. Optional section. We are very much interested in documenting narrative accounts of media directors' experiences and frustrations in dealing with crises during the past few years. If you have a case history that you would be willing to share with us, please describe it here or on the back of this page. Anonymity is guaranteed. Institutions and respondents will not be identified in the final report summarizing this section.

31. Would you be willing to share your experiences at an AECT convention session? Yes_____ No_____

_____ _____

Name of person completing form Title

Please return this form by November 8, 1982 to: Mike Albright, Chair, DEMM Higher Education Task Force, c/o Media Resources Center, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011

Appendix C

Responding Institutions

Research Universities -- Public
Auburn University
Florida State University
Indiana University
Iowa State University
Ohio State University
Oregon State University
Purdue University
Temple University
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
University of California, San Diego
University of Cincinnati
University of Georgia
University of Hawaii, Manoa
University of Iowa
University of Nebraska
University of Oklahoma
University of Oregon
University of Utah
Washington State University

Research Universities -- Private
Boston University
Brandeis University
Brown University
Cornell University
George Washington University
Georgetown University
Illinois Institute of Technology
Johns Hopkins University
Syracuse University
Tufts University
University of Rochester
University of Southern California

Doctorate-Granting Universities -- Public
Bowling Green State University
East Texas State University
Illinois State University
Kent State University
Memphis State University
North Dakota State University
North Texas State University
Northern Illinois University
Ohio University
University of Akron
University of Alabama
University of Delaware
University of Idaho
University of Maine

Appendix C -- page 2

Doctorate-Granting Universities -- Public (continued)
University of Missouri, Kansas City
University of North Dakota
University of South Carolina
University of Vermont
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

Doctorate-Granting Universities -- Private
Adelphi University
American University
Brigham Young University
Dartmouth College
Fordham University
Lehigh University
Marquette University
Northeastern University
Southern Methodist University
Texas Christian University
University of Denver
University of Notre Dame

Comprehensive Colleges and Universities -- Public
Alcorn State University
Appalachian State University
Armstrong State College
California State College, Stanislaus
Central Washington University
College of William and Mary
Eastern New Mexico University
Ferris State College
Fort Hays State University
Framingham State College
George Mason University
Georgia Southwestern College
Glassboro State College
Idaho State University
Kearney State University
Lake Superior State College
Minot State College
Nicholls State University
North Carolina A&T State University
Northeast Louisiana University
Northwestern State University
Oregon Institute of Technology
Pittsburg State University
San Diego State University
SUNY College at Cortland
SUNY College at Fredonia
University of North Carolina, Charlotte
University of Northern Iowa
University of South Florida
University of Southwestern Louisiana
University of Wisconsin, LaCrosse
University of Wisconsin, Whitewater

Comprehensive Colleges and Universities -- Public (continued)
Virginia State University
Wayne State College
West Georgia College
Western New Mexico University
Wichita State University
Winona State University
Worcester State College

Comprehensive Colleges and Universities -- Private
Concordia Teachers College
Elmira College
Fairfield University
John Carroll University
King's College (Pa.)
Oklahoma Baptist University
Russell Sage College
Seattle Pacific University
Seattle University
Simmons College
St. Norbert College
St. Olaf College
Suffolk University
University of Hartford
Valparaiso University
West Virginia Wesleyan College

Liberal Arts Colleges -- Public
Lander College
Lyndon State College
University of Maryland, Baltimore County
University of North Carolina, Asheville

Liberal Arts Colleges -- Private
Agnes Scott College
Alma College
Aquinas College
Briarcliff College
Central College
Central Wesleyan College
Colby College
College of New Rochelle
Concordia College
Davidson College
Findlay College
Hamilton College
Hartwick College
Hollins College
Huron College
Jarvis Christian College
Kings College (N.Y.)
Lake Erie College
Lycoming College
Manhattanville College

Liberal Arts Colleges -- Private (continued)
Marietta College
Marymount College
McPherson College
Muhlenberg College
Queens College (N.C.)
Southwestern University
St. John Fisher College
Sweet Briar College
University of Redlands
Washington and Jefferson College
Wheeling College
Whittier College
Wilmington College

Community and Junior Colleges -- Public
American River College
Arizona Western College
Bellevue Community College
Blue Mountain Community College
Brevard Community College
Bucks County Community College
Cape Cod Community College
Charles County Community College
Community College of Allegheny County
Cowley County Community College
Diablo Valley College
Grand Rapids Junior College
Hagerstown Junior College
Highline Community College
Hutchinson Community College
Iowa Lakes Community College
Middlesex Community College
Minneapolis Community College
Modesto Junior College
Orange Coast College
Porterville College
Riverside City College
Rockland Community College
Santa Fe Community College
Schoolcraft College
Suffolk County Community College
Tacoma Community College
University of Minnesota Technical College, Crookston
Worthington Community College

Community and Junior Colleges -- Private
Bay Path Junior College
Dean Junior College
Grand View College
Green Mountain College
Lees-McRae College
Mary Holmes College
Montreat-Anderson College

Community and Junior Colleges -- Private (continued)
Ohio Valley College
Presentation College
Suomi College
Union College
Villa Maria College of Buffalo
Wesley College

Appendix D

Comments Provided in "Free Response" Items

General.

(RES/PUB) "The (center) went "campus wide" in July of 1981. Prior to that time the (center) served only the College of Education. (institution) had a central media service, but it had been disbanded 10-12 years ago as a cost-cutting means.

The way the (center) became campus wide and now enjoys good (indeed excellent) faculty and administrative support was by design: built on service, grounded in academics re a laboratory for educational technology graduate programs; "low" profile and growing only on documented need -- not impractical, idealistic "hardware" kinds of desire on part of media professionals -- and with a five year plan, then a second five year plan patiently developed and explained to decision makers -- faculty governance and administrators. The first five year plan was developed in 1976."

(RES/PUB) "Sorry it has taken me so long to return your questionnaire but let me explain what I believe is a very positive merger that effects the responses to many of the questions.

The director of classroom television, (name), and I, along with our Dean of Undergraduate Studies, (name), began working on a merger concept for the (media) and (television) centers in July. (media) and (television) were the two University media service units. The Dean announced the merger and the new name of the combined units, (center), in October 1982. This merger has not caused any reduction in budgets or personnel; our expectation is that it will allow us to expand our services to the instructional faculty and to make these services more efficient and effective with the integration of similar functions and staffs. At this point in time we have not been merged long enough to provide actual data to support these expectations in a very subjective way, i.e., staff morale, shared functions and facilities and especially the very positive relationship between the two administrative officers. I am convinced that we have the beginnings of a very positive merger." [Note: this response was submitted from a state experiencing severe economic problems.]

(LIB/PRI) "The feeling on the part of administrators in the past two years was that (institution) must improve its A-V support or it would fall behind too far to catch up, that its earlier inferior status was limiting faculty development and therefore the college's competitiveness. We now lead our peers as identified in the Bowdoin library survey."

(CJC/PUB) "As a long-time audiovisual director and now director of a library, I find it no longer possible to make artificial distinctions among the various acedemic support services encompassed in library/media operation. As the "only game in town" we serve the campus with all forms of media support. The emphasis here is on information services, and type of medium is

seldom a primary consideration. The growth of the program has been impacted by state budget problems, but the library has fared well in context of the total College budget."

7. Please list the job titles of non-student positions (at least 50% time) in your media center that have been deleted since 1977-78.

(RES/PUB) "We have reduced the size of our staff [from 100 to 61] but have eliminated few, if any, functions."

(LIB/PRI) "We're growing like mad, with a 1000% increase in quantity of service in last 2 years."

(CJC/PUB) "Due to Prop 13, our people were reduced from 12 months to 10 months and then back up to 11 months."

9. Did your media center generate revenue in 1981-81?

(LIB/PRI) "We do not wish to ever get into a chargeback situation which discourages service, when all money eventually comes from the college."

13. Please list the funding source, amount, and purpose of all current grants received from off-campus sources.

(RES/PUB) "No grants per se but we do work for a number of off-campus, non-university, not-for-profit organizations and have income from these projects."

(RES/PUB) "We are involved in several production contracts with off-campus agencies as a routine part of our operations, but no outright grants."

(RES/PUB) "Other departments receive grants and use our services which allows us to generate some production revenue."

(RES/PRI) "Training and Development Activity for Cairo University Medical Center -- World Bank Funding; Training of Nigerian Military Television Technicians -- Superior Teaching Systems."

19. If you indicated that your media center is healthy, to what do you attribute its health?

(RES/PUB) "Excellent direction, leadership, support from administration. Excellent staff."

(RES/PUB) "Good support from employees and good support by top campus management. In general, good management."

(RES/PUB) "To the fact that we are new; the economic health of (state) is stable; our president is media-aware; our provost is media aware and the (center) started small and worked toward credibility. Also the fact that the director is an academic --

with earned tenure and earned rank -- and active in faculty governance -- helps give the (center) mission/task credibility with clients/faculty users."

(RES/PUB) "We make a sincere effort to serve our designated clientele & the clientele knows it."

(RES/PUB) "Firm administrative support, prudent managment, reasonably sound state government."

(RES/PUB) "Support by director of libraries and faculty."

(RES/PUB) "Meeting organizational needs not personal wims [sic]."

(RES/PUB) "Lean, competent staff; highly motivated and productive."

(RES/PUB) "Good support from the University administration. The continued demand for instructional classroom support (all media including television) by the faculty."

(RES/PUB) "Effort of staff in keeping costs down; ability to earn income to furnish needs of department; faculty support."

(RES/PUB) "Continued philosophical and financial support by the central administration of the university; attitude of personnel in the center as being one of service; the willingness of the director to talk to and work with all units and personnel in the center to resolve any problems that develop."

(RES/PUB) "Initiative of staff to improve service and products. Awareness, although not maximized yet, of faculty and admiistration to provide support when available. Maintaining a philosophy that is current and flexible and can change with the time."

(RES/PRI) "Meeting client needs on a fee-for-service basis."

(RES/PRI) "Administrative support from dean and vice president; cost saving innovations; good relation with faculty."

(RES/PRI) "Meeting needs with quality service/materials/programs.

(RES/PRI) "Have an adequate budget this year. New video equibment [sic] ordered, development of patient education television system. Best staff ever."

(RES/PRI) "(center) did not exist until recently so it could only improve. The demand for services has grown."

(RES/PRI) "A-V personnel that knows the job & what equipment needed to be purchased and elimination of waste."

(RES/PRI) "Library support and general use."

(RES/PRI) "Aggressive approach to development of grant and contact sources of funding for project activity and for media design and production for other university grant activity. A newly developed approach to management improvement that works on basic services to faculty and an internal audit of our services by the university. Measurement of all of our services in dollar amounts for accountability."

(DOC/PUB) "Demand for certain services by some faculty and administration members."

(DOC/PUB) "Quality service, good communication, in-depth reports, healthy image, excellent staff, great support from provost's office."

(DOC/PUB) "Access to administration, availability of ID incentive grant money from an endowment."

(DOC/PUB) "Good support, good staff."

(DOC/PUB) "Demand for service by faculty; support from dean and higher administration."

(DOC/PUB) "The (center) provides for the integral instructional needs of the faculty on the campus."

(DOC/PUB) "(1) Meeting the needs of the faculty as attested by responses to our biennial satisfaction questionnaire sent to users; (2) Our insistence on not charging for services and production for instructional use; (3) For the near future, our alignment with a technologically growing campus organization."

(DOC/PUB) "Increasing awareness of the importance of media in education."

(DOC/PUB) "Providing good basic services to the academic community."

(DOC/PUB) "POLITICAL ACTION -- Let the faculty & staff know constantly what you can do for them -- plus what you have done."

(DOC/PUB) "The creation of (center) strengthened the library's political base within the university."

(DOC/PUB) "We are an integral part of the library's budget. We have a clear idea of what our service goals are and we do a relatively good job of meeting them, although we are not sufficiently well staffed. We have a relatively good image on campus."

(DOC/PUB) "Creative ability to do a variety of tasks beyond what is traditionally thought of as a library learning center."

(DOC/PRI) "Attitude and support of entire university family."

(DOC/PRI) "Dedicated full-time personnel."

(DOC/PRI) "Technological thrust of entire university."

(DOC/PRI) "A new facility."

(DOC/PRI) "Increasing faculty interest and use of services in spite of budgetary restrictions."

(DOC/PRI) "Diversification into public communications areas: PSA's, commercials for campus, PR, development, etc."

(DOC/PRI) "Interest in media by faculty, staff, and related organizations -- new concepts, i.e., multi-image, teleconference, better TV production."

(COMP/PUB) "Accreditation visit last year."

(COMP/PUB) "Consistent and stable funding; shift in administrative control."

(COMP/PUB) "Student/faculty interest and equipment inventory."

(COMP/PUB) "Responsibility for cable television function; university located in urban setting with high cable penetration; increased awareness of value of strong software collection on campus; this has led to growth of collection during last two years; NSF microcomputing grant "gave" (center) 20 microcomputers and video projectors; excellent resource for faculty."

(COMP/PUB) "Change in personnel."

(COMP/PUB) "The quantity and quality of services provided. A philosophy of providing service."

(COMP/PUB) "Best run office on campus for service, inventory, equipment (condition), providing help."

(COMP/PUB) "Administrative support leading to increased faculty use of services."

(COMP/PUB) "Past services provided to faculty."

(COMP/PUB) "Continuing, although limited financial support."

(COMP/PUB) "Use of our services is increasing each year. We function as part of information services along with the library. We receive the same support."

(COMP/PUB) "Supportive dean; a few very dedicated faculty; good student acceptance; very good management."

(COMP/PUB) "Significance of operation to the college both in service support and instruction. Recognition of the services by the administration."

(COMP/PUB) "Constantly devising programs and promoting them by memo and word of mouth; the ability to expend revenue, allowing the set up of new services (which in turn generate more revenue)."

(COMP/PUB) "Good faculty and administrative relations plus an excellent AV specialist."

(COMP/PUB) "The 1978 media standards approved by the trustees of the California State University system may be funded during the next few years with pressure from the Legislative Analyst for the California State Legislature and commensurate interest in meeting the guidelines on the part of the central administration of the college."

(COMP/PUB) "Support from library director and vice president."

(COMP/PUB) "Solid, well established service."

(COMP/PRI) "Greater support and usage by the faculty."

(COMP/PRI) "Well-stocked in various kinds of basic A-V equipment which seem to suit most of the needs of faculty/staff."

(COMP/PRI) "Increased awareness of media, growth of technology, willingness of institution to keep pace with changes."

(COMP/PRI) "Support of faculty and administration."

(COMP/PRI) "Increased awareness by administration of the nature and potential of instructional technology and institution financial health."

(COMP/PRI) "The budget we do receive and the 3 full-time people who work there."

(COMP/PRI) "Talented staff -- good collections."

(COMP/PRI) "Moral and financial administrative and faculty support of media center programs; more stable and qualified staff; improved management."

(COMP/PRI) "Strong administrative support and a responsive faculty."

(COMP/PRI) "Support from administration and faculty."

(LIB/PUB) "Leadership, administrative support, excellent workers, good budget, planning."

(LIB/PUB) "Support and utilization."

(LIB/PRI) "Audiovisual services on this campus are in a state of development; Demand for services is increasing and faculty support is strong."

(LIB/PRI) "Support from administration and faculty; range (variety) of services; quality of services."

(LIB/PRI) "New director and support for his policies."

(LIB/PRI) "Faculty support; adequate facilities and equipment."

(LIB/PRI) "Conservative management."

(LIB/PRI) "Hard work, public ralations."

(LIB/PRI) "We have been replacing all equipment, that is obsolete with new and updated port-a-pak, and regular video equipment, also purchased 4 new Elmo 16 MM projectors."

(LIB/PRI) "Growth of resources, growth of space. Faculty getting used to idea that there is a full time department to serve them."

(LIB/PRI) "Our ability to take our cues from faculty's expressed need w/o attacking problems from preconceived positions."

(LIB/PRI) "Faculty support; reliable service."

(LIB/PRI) "The addition of several pieces of video equipment to the inventory and the adding of study carrels to the Center."

(LIB/PRI) "The consolidation of physical areas and the continued budget support."

(LIB/PRI) "Positive faculty and administration."

(LIB/PRI) "Dedicated staff."

(LIB/PRI) "New facilities, improved video studio, more equipment."

(LIB/PRI) "Support from faculty and administration and growth of communications/journalism program."

(LIB/PRI) "Budget and desire of superiors."

(LIB/PRI) "Change in management two years ago. Reorganized systems to increase reliability. Brought quality to services already provided. Increased range of services. Generated respect from faculty not previously existing and strong demand for more services, equipment, and staff."

(CJC/PUB) "Good services provided; people who care."

(CJC/PUB) "Increased faculty and student usage as well as more PR through workshops."

(CJC/PUB) "Faculty and student use of materials and services."

(CJC/PUB) "Installation of microcomputers, plans for establishment of a learning assistance center located near media area, personnel staying abreast of needs and new offerings of departments."

(CJC/PUB) "Demands of new technology in teaching. Director of (center) support and institutional support."

(CJC/PUB) "Small operation."

(CJC/PUB) "Superior leadership; ability to adapt, to go with the flow."

(CJC/PUB) "It is very nicely equipted [sic]."

(CJC/PUB) "Success and acceptance by faculty, etc."

(CJC/PUB) "Administration interest in ITFS and future interest in radio."

(CJC/PUB) "New director."

(CJC/PUB) "Maintaining a service program that meets the needs of the teaching faculty."

(CJC/PUB) "Not as much financial help in the area of equipment, yet enough to barely get along."

(CJC/PUB) "Strong support and involvement by the faculty."

(CJC/PRI) "Substantial amount of new equipment was purchased last year. All equipment was redistributed according to need."

(CJC/PRI) "To the hiring of a full-time learning resources librarian."

(CJC/PRI) "We have a good supply of matriel [sic] and equipment."

(CJC/PRI) "Continued interest on the part of the faculty, administration, and librarian."

20. If you indicated that you media center is in some trouble, to what do you attribute this difficulty?

(RES/PUB) "Severe cuts in faculty and staff, greatly increased dependence upon income for salaries."

(RES/PUB) "Funds for capital equipment and staff."

(RES/PUB) "Lack of financial support from university administration. Unable to buy needed equipment. Unable to staff adequately."

(RES/PRI) "Income does not cover expenses, and we are a total income-supported unit!"

(DOC/PUB) "Declining revenues for the institution."

(DOC/PUB) "Our difficulties are related to financial problems. We have lost staff and student positions, as well as funding for general operations. Part of our problem stems from the fact that the (center) must compete for funds with other divisions of our parent organization. Our ability to buy or even replace software and equipment has been negated."

(DOC/PUB) "State budget cuts."

(DOC/PRI) "Lack of an adequate budget."

(DOC/PRI) "Political differences at upper echelons."

(COMP/PUB) "The economic projections in (state) are bad and when the state legislature meets in January we could face some worse cuts. I'm not optimistic about the future, short and long term."

(COMP/PUB) "Decisions will be made im March about the need to go to a full cost-recovery charge-back system for all services. This will reduce our services in the long run. Our staff is productive, efficient, and effective. No one on campus disputes this. It's hard times, and reallocations are going to take place. We are trying to preserve all key elements during reductions so when good times come, we can build support again. Certain faculty committees are trying to decentralize the budget process, which would allow them to acquire more funds directly rather than rely on the deans."

(COMP/PUB) "Budget cut backs. lost [sic] of people."

(COMP/PUB) "For the 16 years that I have been in charge there has been total ignoring of the needs for media services in all categories: staffing, space, equipment purchase and replacement, materials acquisition and operating budget."

(COMP/PUB) "Television facilities outmoded: general budget cuts."

(COMP/PUB) "There has been no direction for a number of years due to funding freeze. Due to this lack a number of individuals have had sufficient political muscle to reduce, or divert funding into different areas, and dismember the media department into small units that cannot present a unified service."

(COMP/PUB) "Funds, administrative commitment."

(COMP/PUB) "Temporary or permanent (?) loss of key positions."

(COMP/PUB) "Lack of clearly defined institutional role and mission; lack of budget."

(COMP/PUB) "Budget shortfall for the state of (state); lack of appreciation and support by the administration; faculty's attitude of guarding their own bowl of rice, claiming A-V to be a support service, therefore eligible for sacrifice and elimination."

(COMP/PUB) "Reduction in state allocation."

(COMP/PRI) "It has been moved to a new location -- more space, no remodeling has yet been done to accommodate it."

(LIB/PRI) "Budget cuts and attitude of president of college."

(LIB/PRI) "Lack of money for equipment repair and replacement and addition of new technology."

(LIB/PRI) "Lack of funds to hire qualified personnel to meet growing demands of IT needs on campus."

(LIB/PRI) "Administration has no concept of what we are or what we should be doing."

(CJC/PUB) "Lack of funds."

(CJC/PUB) "Fiscal problems due to Prop 13 and enrollment loss."

(CJC/PUB) "Finances, resulting in little new equipment and no new staff."

(CJC/PUB) "Loss of revenue to the institution and change of priorities of the current leadership of the institution."

(CJC/PUB) "Continuous yearly budget cuts, resulting in reduction of staff and funds with which to purchase materials and equipment. The state has serious financial problems."

(CJC/PUB) "Lack of money."

21. What are the most serious challenges currently facing your media center?

(RES/PUB) "Possibility of budget cuts."

(RES/PUB) "Keep service level high when budgets are holding the same or getting smaller."

(RES/PUB) "Space -- we are in serious need of space. I think that will come but so slowly (3-5 years) that it will hurt our future growth. We now run two 8-hour shifts anticipating going to a third (graveyard) shift for production work in 1983-84."

(RES/PUB) "Lack of funds and space."

(RES/PUB) "Loss of state revenue which would impact on us."

(RES/PUB) "Making it really a part of the university mainstream; getting our people ready for success."

(RES/PUB) "Finances."

(RES/PUB) "(1) Acquisition of sufficient space to develop merged (center); (2) Informing and involving faculty of new technology and new uses of institutional media."

(RES/PUB) "Funding of essential people/services/programs: (a) staff -- approximately 40 percent of staff on "income monies; (b) equipment monies (state does not allow replacement of equipment via budgeting process; (c) media monies (no budget for orderly acquisition of media -- presently comes from "lapsed funds" -- year end surplus."

(RES/PUB) "Equipment which needs to be replaced because of age and with a lack of adequate equipment funds with which to buy new items."

(RES/PUB) "Providing more materials and equipment for access by faculty and staff; acquiring more seed money to do constructive production on campus that might have a national impact; obtaining more support funding so we aren't as dedicated to income-producing activities."

(RES/PUB) "Generating $150,000 in income to cover the salaries and benefits of employees put on non-state money and to cover deficits incurred by removal of funds in midyear '81 after it was spent."

(RES/PUB) "Finding funds to add staff and equipment."

(RES/PUB) "To maintain current level of service."

(RES/PRI) "Funding of user departments; outside cost competition; promotion of services."

(RES/PRI) "Duplication on campus. How do we join forces with these other media departments for our mutual benefit?"

(RES/PRI) "Maintaining personnel morale in a circumstance where pay scale is substantially lower than other similar positions in this area."

(RES/PRI) "Funding! Faculty use of media."

(RES/PRI) "Funding and space."

(RES/PRI) "Larger budget to handle most visual and audio requests made by faculty."

(RES/PRI) "Funding for new equipment to replace old, and space for microforms -- especially microfilm."

(RES/PRI) "The continuity of development of funding from a university that is private and tuition dependent, particularly at a time of greatly increased tuition costs and negative demographic projections for enrollment."

(RES/PRI) "Increase income; generate new programs to rent and sell."

(DOC/PUB) "Budget cuts to us and our customers."

(DOC/PUB) "Keeping up with price increases for spare parts and services, yet continuing to provide more service without additional personnel."

(DOC/PUB) "Possible takeover by the library."

(DOC/PUB) "Funding, staffing."

(DOC/PUB) "Space."

(DOC/PUB) "Cutback in funding -- which is affecting entire university -- not just media center. Another consideration is the possible reorganization effective January."

(DOC/PUB) "Providing consistent quality services in an inflationary economy and limited budgets."

(DOC/PUB) "Budget constraints, staff limitations, equipment limitations."

(DOC/PUB) "Budget."

(DOC/PUB) "Potential declining enrollment plus declining income."

(DOC/PUB) "Upgrading the collection with film prices escalating horribly; writing more grants."

(DOC/PUB) "We must come to terms with how student production support is to be handled. Also, there is insufficient resource available currently to handle this. We also must work out how to use the new wide area network cable TV system currently being installed."

(DOC/PUB) "Interpreting the values of the services to the university community."

(DOC/PUB) "$$$$$$$$$"

(DOC/PUB) "Development of more current holdings."

(DOC/PUB) "To prevent being broken up by the administration."

(DOC/PRI) "Charting a course for the future."

(DOC/PRI) "Operating on a reduced budget."

(DOC/PRI) "Nonuse by faculty, no incentives for use; lack of organizational development; no instructional design thrust."

(DOC/PRI) "To increase equipment inventory; to increase use."

(DOC/PRI) "Gaining adequate administrative support -- both academically and budgetarily."

(DOC/PRI) "Budgetary, personnel shortages."

(DOC/PRI) "Loss of one good source of revenue; working toward bigger facilities where more services can be offered; need for more professional staff."

(DOC/PRI) "Lack of money -- an administration that will not face the immediate and future needs of the university because of pressures from other areas."

(DOC/PRI) "Integrating with the library; replacing rapidly obsolescent equipment."

(COMP/PUB) "The economic situation in (state). If cuts continue to be made, accreditation report or not, the (center) will lose out."

(COMP/PUB) "Keeping abreast of campus media needs through adequate funding, staff; keeping abreast of useful innovations applicable to my campus needs."

(COMP/PUB) "Convincing the administration to review all services and policies which can be affected by reallocation. The process can be chaotic if the administration does not guide the process."

(COMP/PUB) "Operational funding."

(COMP/PUB) "Space; media collection development; budget, in light of state of (state) fiscal problems."

(COMP/PUB) "Cash, staffing."

(COMP/PUB) "New priorities, established by president (new faculty and other equipment)."

(COMP/PUB) "Budget cutbacks hindering services and growth."

(COMP/PUB) "Retain good help -- money and training."

(COMP/PUB) "Lack of staff compared to demands and requests."

(COMP/PUB) "Lack of faculty, limited quarters, additional equipment."

(COMP/PUB) "Delivering needed materials to faculty and classrooms."

(COMP/PUB) "Money for A/V materials and replace cost position."

(COMP/PUB) "Money for equipment, space, some deadwood faculty."

(COMP/PUB) "Funding to cover basic services and equipment; additional technical support to keep pace with new technology."

(COMP/PUB) "Adapting to changing technology (especially microcomputers); getting faculty to think in terms of using media as integral parts of instruction; keeping up with ever-increasing demand with the same staff size."

(COMP/PUB) "Learning enough about the new computer technology to effectively utilize it in our area."

(COMP/PUB) "Accepting the fact that the aspiration to increase media services is contingent upon availability of funds. In an entrenchment [sic] area we are currently given assurance that media needs are a #1 priority. It is up to us to kindle that interest and secure faculty support."

(COMP/PUB) "Funds."

(COMP/PUB) "Service; rejuvenate TV delivery and production."

(COMP/PUB) "Lack of funds for materials and personnel; lack of long range planning; lack of administrative support."

(COMP/PUB) "Operating funds."

(COMP/PUB) "Weak state economy causing budget reductions and position freezes or elimination."

(COMP/PUB) "Budget cutbacks."

(COMP/PUB) "Trying to match client expectations to administratively determined responsibilities and resources."

(COMP/PUB) "Funding."

(COMP/PRI) "Too little professional staff; lack of adequate darkroom, etc., in new location."

(COMP/PRI) "Television production needs to be improved."

(COMP/PRI) "Training of faculty to use and adaption of media -- producing media to relieve some burden on departments. Addition of one faculty member to relieve instruction burden."

(COMP/PRI) "Inflation -- equipment replacement and repair. Promoting instructional development among faculty."

(COMP/PRI) "Program development to reach level of 'basic program'."

(COMP/PRI) "We need more video equipment."

(COMP/PRI) "High cost of hard and soft ware."

(COMP/PRI) "Maintaining adequate funding and/or budgeting in times of declining enrollment; role of (center) in integration of computer technology."

(COMP/PRI) "Preparing for the advent of cable; self-reorganization (systems and space)."

(COMP/PRI) "Maintain level of service with diminishing resources."

(LIB/PUB) "Need extra personnel."

(LIB/PUB) "Equipping a TV studio."

(LIB/PRI) "Loss of funding effort and an unfriendly president of the college."

(LIB/PRI) "Audiovisual services are under the direction of the library and the head of AV services is called upon to perform library duties other than audiovisual. To meet the increasing demand for media services on campus it will be necessary to eliminate non-related duties from the media person's schedule and employ one non-student person, at least on a part-time basis."

(LIB/PRI) "To convince the library administration that AV services are an important element of library services."

(LIB/PRI) "Developing expanded media center to include more services and up to date technology."

(LIB/PRI) "Increase staff; increase budget for materials (software); maintenance of equipment."

(LIB/PRI) "Obtaining funds for equipment repair, replacement, and additions; obtaining funds for new materials; supervisory time for management."

(LIB/PRI) "Finance."

(LIB/PRI) "Growing demand, static funding."

(LIB/PRI) "Physical space; money; time to do anything but essentials."

(LIB/PRI) "The unfair copyright law."

(LIB/PRI) "Less capital expenditure available."

(LIB/PRI) "Funds for additional equipment and for the repairing of equipment."

(LIB/PRI) "More requests for production than we are able to handle with student help."

(LIB/PRI) "Funding due to lower student enrollments and the bad economy."

(LIB/PRI) "Gaining trust of faculty so they will allow a centralized service; space; financial support."

(LIB/PRI) "Money for repairs of current equipment and for purchases of new equipment."

(LIB/PRI) "Keeping up with demand for media services especially in growth area of continuing education."

(LIB/PRI) "Small equipment budget and need for updated equipment."

(LIB/PRI) "Lack of personnel; long hours; little funding for acquisition of new hardware and software; increasing expectations for service with personnel and equipment to meet those expectations."

(LIB/PRI) "Increasing usage and quality of usage by faculty; improving image of department in eyes of administration."

(LIB/PRI) "We are moving toward instructional development, using TVRO dishes, and computer assisted instruction as new functions for our department. Must work out how we fit in with computer center, dean's office, and academic departments in this endeavor."

(CJC/PUB) "Lack of staff, especially technical."

(CJC/PUB) "Equipment replacement."

(CJC/PUB) "Cuts in state funding to the institutions will cause cuts in our day-to-day and long-term operations. Supplies and equipment already feeling somewhat of a pinch. Copyright laws -- Sony vs. Disney."

(CJC/PUB) "Maintaining interest in media by faculty; adding and efficiently carrying out additional services without addition to staff."

(CJC/PUB) "Expansion of video services in production and playback. Cablevision telecourses for continuing education."

(CJC/PUB) "Budget shortfalls -- statewide problem."

(CJC/PUB) "Time."

(CJC/PUB) "Additional staff to help with production, and money to purchase and replace equipment."

(CJC/PUB) "Equipment replacement."

(CJC/PUB) "Keeping abreast of increasing demand for service. Maintaining quality services. Maintaining staff morale."

(CJC/PUB) "Capital replacement."

(CJC/PUB) "Maintaining minimum service levels/equipment & staff."

(CJC/PUB) "Maintaining the viable services to our faculty with the limited resources available, and the rebuilding of the department."

(CJC/PUB) "Restrictive budgets, resulting in loss of staff, reduced services, little or no growth in collections, few funds to maintain or replace equipment, and little opportunity to engage in new technological approaches."

(CJC/PUB) "Keeping old equipment in good repair."

(CJC/PUB) "Continued tightening of budgets; effective, reliable utilization of new technology; maintenance -- good service against obtaining parts for 10-year old equipment, lengthening use of equipment, non-compatibility -- computers, video."

(CJC/PRI) "Get the instructors to use the software more frequently."

(CJC/PRI) "Faculty assignments for student use. Change of college curricula."

(CJC/PRI) "Need for qualified staff technicians."

22. Do you feel that your media center has been hurt by "competition" from other media operations on campus?

(RES/PUB) "We have a close working relationship which promotes rather than causes competition."

(RES/PUB) "We promote them. They do "small stuff", e.g., many have VTR's and cameras; however they bring tapes to us for editing."

(RES/PRI) "We're not hurt, but closer cooperation would benefit all."

(DOC/PUB) "The campus Instructional Media Committee tries to prevent "competition" and promote cooperation. When one does not charge, how can others compete?"

(LIB/PRI) "The dean eliminated all other centers, putting everything under our administration during the past 2 years, as growth in respect allowed."

(CJC/PUB) "Not yet, but we are constantly on guard and aware of that potential."

23. How does your media center promote itself?

(RES/PUB) "We feel that service is why we are here and when we provide the service, we are promoting."

(RES/PRI) "The director has a personal friend in each academic department, and director has additional friends as assistants to deans."

(COMP/PUB) "Most effective method has been to plan and provide services that the faculty want, then the services promote themselves."

(COMP/PUB) "All [PR methods listed in questionnaire] have been counterproductive or of little tangible value -- one-to-one contacts still the best."

(LIB/PRI) "Director has built respect by teaching and coaching on campus."

(LIB/PRI) "We try not to promote ourselves. We have too much work now."

Appendix E

Case Histories/Narratives

30. Optional section. We are very much interested in documenting narrative accounts of media directors' experiences and frustrations in dealing with crises during the past few years. If you have a case history that you would be willing to share with us, please describe it here or on the back of this page. Anonymity is guaranteed. Institutions and respondents will not be identified in the final report summarizing this section.

(RES/PUB) "This may be short sighted because of newness to the profession. The situation which exists at our institution which is my main pet peeve is inadequate funding to maintain and upgrade our film library and equipment utilization pool. Both of these dilemmas have been adequately documented to the appropriate administrative source.

We do not and would prefer not to have a charge back system for providing film and equipment to our faculty. We do not, however, receive adequate funding to maintain a current library or equipment pool which possesses all the technologically advanced equipment our faculty should have access to. In fact, we don't even have enough 35mm and 16mm projectors in the pool to meet needs.

With an equipment pool and library which individually have values that exceed $1,000,000 in replacement value, but have been 80% depreciated, it becomes apparent that yearly allocations must increase if the value of these two resources are to be maintained.

The reason for this happening, or not happening, are speculative only. However, certain national trends including 'recession' and 'high priority' needs are usually stated as reasonable rationale. In the end, however, who will ultimately lose because these resources have not been maintained at a current needs level?"

(RES/PUB) "One staff member has had difficulty getting along with those who work under him. He is retired military and can't seem to get away from line and staff command concepts. His public relations and human relations with his staff have been very poor to good at best. I have talked to him, withheld salary advances, suggested other jobs, and he is still here. He has improved. He finally realized that he was part (major in my estimate) of the problem and has made an effort to improve."

(RES/PUB) "Budgetary problems in recent years have effected most of the university service departments. In general media activity is not a high priority item in the overall university operation, and is not funded adequately."

(RES/PUB) "We've missed the chance to have lots of time to think about media in higher education. Universities and colleges are in a crisis -- media services must find ways that these institutions can become more productive (lower cost, more benefit, etc.) or media will be thrown out as 'unnecessary'."

(RES/PUB) "When our new provost was selected, my counterpart at his last institution called and advised me of his (the provost's) role in drastically reducing the size and scope of the media program. Forewarned and forearmed, it was still to no avail. This provost's limited perception of media has prevailed, aided by a state of financial emergency which suspended tenure."

(RES/PRI) "We have really had no crises here at (institution). In the past two years, we have moved into new quarters, our budget has dramatically increased, new programs are being introduced, staff numbers and quality is increasing, enrollments (despite national trends) are continuing upward, and we have strong administrative backing."

(RES/PRI) "We have just had an audit of our total media operation and have found that the final report was supportive to many of the proposals that we have been making for the past several years. The audit was carried out by our Internal Auditing department. They looked at our business procedures, accountability measures, personnel practice, services delivery, etc. This might not work at another university if the purpose was to find reasons for terminating a unit."

(DOC/PUB) "The division of responsibility for media services on this campus has both its problems and its merits. The greatest problems have been budgetary. Integration into the operations of the library while cooperating with the instructional services area with little documentation of decisions has been frustrating at times. Our biggest lack on campus has been insufficient and readily available technical expertise for evaluation of systems and equipment."

(DOC/PUB) "My major frustrations center around the fact that the (center) has to compete with other branches of our parent organization. It is especially frustrating when we know that the (center) is the most heavily utilized branch of our facility, but has funds diverted for 'pet projects'. Case in point: we lost our media specialist position so that another employee could be kept on in a less utilized area."

(DOC/PUB) "The greatest crisis was the budget crunch of 1976. I was warned by the associate provost that the center was quite vulnerable. I got together with my staff and determined that each area, with special emphasis on the instructional development program, would re-examine goals and accomplishments -- particularly in terms of the impact of our services on instruction. A long document emerged; meetings were held with the associate provost; we sweat it out; faculty members

(clients) wrote letters of support. We sweat some more, and survived!! Every unit then had to give up 10% of its staff -- an agonizing decision for unit administrators. At least, we only had to lost two people -- as tough as that was."

(DOC/PUB) "Need quicker decisions, positive or negative, from higher ups."

(DOC/PRI) "Ours has been a gradual 'grass roots' rise from nothing to something -- since 1970, when there was no media use on campus."

(DOC/PRI) "I have a ten-year long saga of war stories chronicling the creation and development of a large media center at a major university. Includes facility design and media implementation."

(DOC/PRI) "In 1979 a new provost sought to cut back the budget and possibly to disband the center and distribute resources to departments. I managed to convince him not to do so."

(DOC/PRI) "(1) Top management is curriculum and program design oriented, not process oriented. (2) As a result, media center staff tends to be 'request' reactive rather than project or long run oriented."

(COMP/PUB) "Things were going along fine. (The center) was providing an effective service. During 1977-81, there were budget cuts of about 3 to 5 percent each year, but we adjusted and maintained the full level of services. Despite these cuts, we presented our case convincingly to the administration, and during 1977-80 secured increases of 50 percent in the capital outlay and materials and supplies budget. At the same time, staffing was increased by 20 percent. These financial inroads in times of tight budgets were reflective of increasing demand for our services, quality of these services, and support from the library and university administration. We had reasons to feel good.

Prior to 1977, (the center) had suffered rather badly from a poor image for providing services. Some faculty were still antagonistic toward us and did not utilize these services. By early 1979 we decided it was time to address the image situation by expanding our role to include faculty and instructional development. Through our efforts and administrative approval, we established the (instructional development center). I was appointed its acting director with no released time, no additional compensation, and no clerical staff. My boss, the university librarian, strongly supported the (instructional development center) and authorized me to utilize the media center staff for support.

During the next two years I worked rather closely with about 20 faculty members and assisted another 25 through teaching improvement consultations. A small grants progam sponsored by the (instructional development center) funded 34 faculty projects, and

through our regional consortium for higher education I secured funding for another 20 professors for improvement of their teaching activities. We were reaching nearly 25 percent of the university's faculty members and were looking ahead to building the program in the years to come. We were receiving many verbal and written "thank you's" for this service.

Then, in 1981-82, it all came apart. First, the university librarian left and was replaced by someone with a total lack of any background in or appreciation for media. Then a new academic vice president arrived, equally unsympathetic toward media. The librarian decided that the library should not be in the equipment circulation business, and that film rentals should cease. But worst of all, he had no use for the (instructional development center). Although the academic vice president was initially supportive of the (instructional development center), lobbying by the librarian and the demands of other university concerns wore him down, and he lost the incentive to support us.

In addition, the librarian resented my direct access to the vice president and took a dim view of my involvement with various professional organizations. During the summer of 1982, he took steps that all but shut down the (media center and ID center). The (media center's) operating budget was reduced by 40 percent, including a 65 percent reduction in capital outlay. My position was eliminated, and other positions were either deleted or left unfilled. What had such great promise was destroyed by two unenlightened and insensitive individuals."

(COMP/PUB) "The dual administration of an instructional unit and a service unit erodes effectiveness of either or both units without clear definitions in budgeting staffing, and servicing. Several excellent possibilities exist in a dual setting: provision of laboratory for students, student opportunities to become involved in faculty-student teaching-learning activities, etc. But sound planning, management, and financial support are required lest the dual roles lead to frustration."

(COMP/PUB) "Because of an entrenched emphasis on print media and a strong political environment by the college librarian, it has been impossible to make a case for media services. Book money, which could be used for acquisition of non-print materials, is turned back to the state because faculty members cannot spend funds available. Efforts to get funding are thwarted by an administration attitude that, until now, has neglected all attempts to develop instructional technology on a systematic basis."

(COMP/PUB) "Little has been done to 'educate' administrators (presidents, VP's) about the nature of the 'new technology'. Many still associate media with the library processes of storage and processing. Makes a real tough battle to fight! How about using publications <u>they</u> read as vehicles of communication. Design some teleconferences geared to them."

(COMP/PUB) "The (center) at (institution) is experiencing tremendous problems due to three basic deficiencies. One is the lack of a director. Without a director no cohesive planning is done for both long and short term goals. In fact, the (center) staggers from one catastrophe to another utilizing what at best might be termed crisis planning. Also, without a director, no protection is afforded to the media center with respect to political affairs. The second major problem is that of financial limits. Funding is at a seven-year low with no relief in sight. As funding goes down and the political pressure intensifies to do more, the morale has gone to pot. An overwhelming lethargic attitude has come to the (center). These three problems are so persuasive I expect in five years the (center) will cease to exist."

(COMP/PUB) "(1) Our equipment and supplies (non-salary) budget is now lower by about $5,000 from its 1974 level. (2) Our TV production positions have been eliminated; (3) The vice chancellor for this area has not visited the (center) in eight years."

(COMP/PUB) "The loss of AV equipment by academic departments. These losses are ignored by the administration. Consequently, I have had to get after these people."

(LIB/PRI) "Our unofficial title is "Bellow and Howl Center". Enough said?"

(LIB/PRI) "I came to (institution) two years ago after six years of work at (another institution), which has a highly developed program. My main frustration here was the absence of a local professional organization and the abysmal state of the systems by which the (center) ran. All initial effort for six months was on evaluating and changing existing systems and printed forms and on training program development for student employees.

The department blundered along with its previous inefficiency during this time with some immediate changes in particularly screwed up areas (different scheduling techniques, putting an obnoxious secretary in another position where she couldn't do any more damage). We did not generate much good will during this period, but I felt I could overcome being initially identified with the same old sloppy department once the changes were planned and implemented. I was correct. During the next semester word got around that we really had changed, and during the last year we have become a highly respected department. This change of attitude resulted in the infusion of a large (200K) grant and doubling our budget and staff."

(LIB/PRI) "By the standards of any other institution, this outfit would be considered a disaster, but for us it represents a positive change. Prior to this academic year, this media center served only the departments of Nursing, Clinical Science, and Biology. It had no budget; all purchases were subject to the

approval of the chairpersons of the above departments. The rest of the campus was served by the library, which had one 16mm projector, one cassette recorder, one overhead projector, and one out-of-order filmstrip projector, or by equipment in individual academic departments. There was seldom enough money budgeted for maintenance or repair. Many pieces of equipment stood unused for lack of a lamp, while other items had never been uncrated. Cooperation between departments was non-existent.

After a series of bad decisions in past years, the administration finally decided that a centralized service would be the best solution to consolidate equipment and services, but then seemed all too ready to back down when met with the complaints of the 'haves' on campus. Enter a new dean of instruction who rushes in where wise men fear to tread. I have the dean's unqualified support in the consolidation effort!

The budget is deplorable, but infinitely better than having no budget (and therefore no autonomy) whatsoever. Last year I had no input into the budgeting process. This year, with a new dean and a new college president, I hope to have some say in the process.

I was hired at the beginning of the 1981-82 academic yuear while the center still served only three departments. I was hired largely because I have a master's degree in biology. My degree in library science seemed of little consequence to those hiring me. It's a humorous position to be in -- being respected for having one degree, while the other degree is doing most of the work! I have scant formal training in the audiovisual field and now that it seems that the position is rather stable, I plan to investigate professional associations as sources of information.

My predecessor in this position was also a professional librarian, but one to whom certain given standards of the profession must have seemed tedious and boring. Instead of any standard cataloging being done with the software collection, she created a main entry access, alphabetical list on the college computer. There is no terminal in the center, indeed no terminal nearby and no access except by main entry. In addition, the shelf arrangement of the software bore no relation to the computer list, and there was no way for a new media director, new student, or faculty member to find any particular item. The old hands located items strictly by color, size, and shape of container. There was no inventory of equipment, either, so that when I was approached with questions on the whereabouts of items during my first weeks on the job, I had no way of knowing whether we even had a particular thing. Creating order out of chaos was the order of last year's business, to be tidied up and finalized this year. This year's challenge is to win allies from the faculty ranks and attempt to catalog all software on campus with the eventual hope of storing it centrally so that all may have access to software programs.

I enjoy challenges, and this is one of those lovely positions

where I can vent my irritation at the follies of the past and roll up my sleeves and do what I think is best to improve the situation without having too much outside interference."

(CJC/PUB) "Basically, we're treading water. Budgets are up a little one year and down a little the next. We identify key areas and concentrate there -- most recently 'support of the teacher in the classroom'. We survive by providing basic services (very little production work). We still have a photographer, an illustrator, and a TV 'manager', but all have collateral duties as well. We are always hoping for more tourism which begets larger state revenues which provides larger college budgets. The old cycle! Morale is pretty good. All are involved in decision making to the degree they want be. The LR dean is new this term, but very positive toward the media area."

(CJC/PUB) "We have an ongoing crisis of trying to maintain daily functions and at the same time plan and set goals for the future with limited staff. Our first priority is service. We never get caught up on goals, procedure writing and updating, statistics maintenance, etc. What's new?"

(CJC/PUB) "Up until the present, management (including me) have operated on a cut services, retain faculty philosopohy. Our service has done as well as or better than other school support offerings as far as cutbacks are concerned. It appears that tuition is to be imposed which will probably erode our present status and faculty will be reduced by program. Help!!"

(CJC/PRI) "Major frustrations: (1) administration will not hire an AV technician. Programs and services would be enhanced if this happened. (2) I do not handle my budget -- nor does any other program director on campus. All money is controlled by the business manager. Any major charges must be approved by him. He consequently controls policy."